

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the REV. S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., MASTER OF THE TEMPLE, c/o S.P.C.K.
HOUSE, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2, to whom MSS.
should be sent.

Vol. XXVIII

MARCH, 1934

No. 165

EDITORIAL

WE devoted some space a month ago to the union lately achieved between the two Anglo-Catholic Societies in the Church. Since then it is reported that things are going well. In the intricate work of combination, with its consequent duty of "rejecting that which is distempered or ephemeral, and assenting unto such conclusions as the industry of right discourse shall reap," the Church Union has been fortunate in having the skilled help of a distinguished lawyer in Lord Justice Slessor. There have been times in English history when lawyers have set themselves to manage the affairs of the Church in their own way. Now it is happily more common for friendly and accomplished lawyers to give their help in managing the affairs of the Church in the Church's way. The Welsh Church, for example, when it ceased to be established and faced the task of creating afresh its legal constitution, owed an immense debt to two Judges, Lord Sankey and Sir John Banks. The Church Union is beginning to owe a like debt to Sir Henry Slessor, who to his juristic and political qualifications adds a knowledge of theology and philosophy which would do credit to many a professional theologian or philosopher. Many have felt, in studying the laborious but unsatisfactory proceedings of some of the nineteenth-century ecclesiastical trials, what a pity it was that all that learning, all that acumen, all that honesty of purpose, was in great part vitiated by its assumption of that which ought not to have been assumed. The Church, like any other corporation, has its legal side. It also has its points of affinity with the Navy or the Army or the Post Office. But it is not wholly legal. It is not precisely like a secular national institution. It has its own secrets, which are not ascertainable by dint of Old Bailey or Army Council methods. The lawyer who can help us—and, in other fields, the physician or the psychologist or

the philosopher who can help us—is the man who will contribute his expert knowledge to the furtherance of Christian work.

It is evident that the process will take time. In one most important department, that of literature, it appears that there is not at present to be any complete amalgamation. The two bodies which have been known as "The Literature Committee of the E.C.U." and "The Catholic Literature Association" will both continue to exist. It is, of course, undeniable that the provinces of their activity are different. There is a place for scholarly books and there is a place for popular propaganda. Bow and arrows are described in the Authorized Version (1 Sam. xx. 40) as "artillery," but that is only an accident of archaic terminology. The fact is that the methods of archery and big-gun practice are not the same, and there is, happily, more than one way of attacking ignorance and prejudice. Sir Henry Curtis killed King Twala with a battle-axe, and "a certain man" killed King Ahab with an arrow sent "at a venture." Samson employed a unique weapon against the Philistines, and modern warfare has its heavy guns. Or, to drop metaphor, it has to be remembered that Sir William Palmer's portly *Treatise on the Church of Christ* was a book much prized by Mr. Gladstone, while the early Tracts for the Times were sold for a penny each. Both kinds of wisdom were justified by their children. We understand that in this instance there will be *liaison* between the two producing bodies. In both of them is the seed of life. Each will bear fruit after its kind. And with experience the *liaison* will gradually become more intimate, to the gain of both.

A book which must not be missed is Father Hebert's *Intercommunion* (S.P.C.K., 2s., paper). It corresponds on a smaller scale to the Bishop of Lincoln's *The Fullness of Sacrifice*. The writer is consumed by a passion for Reunion, and he knows that the divine desire expressed in St. John xvii. will not be satisfied by anything less than unity at the altar. He sets himself to meet the searching plea of Dr. Carnegie Simpson that since the Lord's Table is His, and not ours, we have no right to repel from His Table those who are His. His treatment of the problem is what might have been expected from so notable a Maurician, and from the translator of Brilioth, Aulén and Nygren. It is profoundly theological. The plea seems at first blush to be itself Maurician. Yet Maurice gives the answer to it. There is great need, as Maurice was never tired of saying,

for both a faith and a practice founded upon God. Not what we feel, but what He is. God is the one Reality. There has been too much of "the psychological approach." What is needed is a more "Biblical" theology, more "Christus Victor," more of the living and commanding Word of God.

This power of the Gospel, says Father Hebert, is held towards us in the Eucharist, that Eucharist which is an instrument of the Universal Church. It is not wonderful that there has been controversy about this Sacrament, for it is a thing too large for us to comprehend. It is not exactly that:

Man's reach must exceed his grasp—
Or what's a heaven for?

It is not even:

Oh, if we draw a circle premature
Heedless of far gain,
Greedy for quick returns of profit, sure
Bad is our bargain.

It is rather that the thing which comes to us out of the Universal Charity of God can be worthily received only by the Universal Church, and demands a Universal Ministry to handle it. At present "we are all in schism, and we all fall short of the fulness of catholicity." We are driven—Romans, Anglicans, Free Churchmen, all of us—by our unhappy divisions into sectarian attitudes. Yet there is a Catholic, non-sectarian temper. By holding to that which is, ideally and really, Universal, we can avoid the sectarian temper and shew ourselves as Catholic as may be. "The Apostolical Succession of the Christian Ministry contains in principle the deliverance from our denominationalism; it contains the seed and the potentiality of the catholicity which holds the promise of the future. Its meaning will be manifest to all when Reunion has taken place, and the Christian Ministry is once again, quite evidently, the Universal Ministry of the Church of Christ." The vision is that of Lambeth, 1920, of "a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole Body."

An act of "open communion" at some great interdenominational gathering would be "a momentary relief to the pain of disunion," "an expression of our desire for unity," but certain inexorable facts would still remain. "It would not have been the sacramental expression of the Christian unity which actually exists in the Anglican, Presbyterian and Methodist,

and the other Churches, but of the unity of spirit existing in a group of individuals . . . potentially the sacrament of a new denomination, composed of groups in the different Churches who desire unity." This is pure Maurice, like the concluding words of *The Kingdom of Christ*. And, we submit, it is pure Catholicism. When it is added that to this large quality of vision Father Hebert joins an eager penitence for the schism in which we are all involved, an unfailing charity, and a clear conviction that in the matter of South India the thing and not the definition is important, it will be plain that this is a book to be read, and read again.

Edward Stuart Talbot, Bishop, was a link with old heroic days, and he was himself cast in the old heroic mould. The last survivor of the *Lux Mundi* group, he carried down to our own time the largeness of outlook, the humane piety, the reasoned optimism, which were among the marks of that famous company. There were some who went so far as to think, when the Primacy was filled in 1903, that a chance had been lost. As we look back on the increasing power and wisdom with which the chair of St. Augustine was filled during the twenty-five years that followed, it is hazardous, even with him in view, to claim that a mistake was really made. Certainly, it is hard to imagine that he himself had any such thought. For with all his ten talents, he was a truly humble man. He had even that rare kind of humility, the supreme gift of thinking justly, in the Pauline way, about himself. It is said that at a comparatively early age, when he was at Keble or Leeds, it was borne in upon him that he would some day be a Bishop. He set himself to grow more fit to meet the great vocation, if it should come to him. The verdict of those who knew him will be that, without failing or even faltering in the duty of true humility, he nobly prepared himself for the noble work which he afterwards accomplished. A great power (it was always supposed) in the counsels of the Bishops, yet willing, when consulted by a young curate, to give patient, careful consideration to the smallest human problem, he was a Father, and in these last years a very Patriarch, in God. He wrote little, partly because he was immersed in other work, but also because he had a directly pastoral conception of his office, and for the sake of the cure of souls committed to his hands he was always giving himself to learn the meaning of more and more and more of the tangled facts of life "in the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." The books of many younger men, less scrupulous than he, are really his.

THE ORIGINS OF THE EPICLESIS

PART I

THE success with which Fr. Hebert, S.S.M., has assailed the convention that an invocation of the Holy Ghost was primitively regarded as effecting eucharistic consecration* encourages the utterance of more radical doubts, chiefly in the hope that he or some other competent scholar will examine a line of evidence which has been a little neglected. The orientalizing school of liturgists dominant among us since the seventeenth century has recently drawn fresh strength from some of the theories of Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl*,† and received full official countenance in the abortive *Books* of 1927-28. Yet to the (doubtless prejudiced) eyes of an unrepentant Western their solutions of the historical problem still seem arbitrary and even unnatural when the evidence is considered as a whole. What follows is, in the result, a defence of our present tradition of consecration, though the investigation upon which it rests was not undertaken for this purpose.

The ante-Nicene history of the text of the eucharistic liturgy is, with one exception, a blank, for which the *disciplina arcani*—the rule that the principal sacramental doctrine might be revealed only to the baptized—is no doubt largely responsible. The introduction of this probably coincided with the organization of the three-year catechumenate which in Rome, at least, seems to fall between St. Justin and St. Hippolytus—*i.e.*, c. A.D. 175.‡ After the peace of the Church this rule was never formally abolished, though its observance grew steadily less and less strict. But St. Cyril and St. Ambrose still give the neophytes their first instructions on the Eucharist *after* their baptism and first Communion, and St. Cyril has an urgent note to the reader charging him not to let even the lectures on baptism fall into the hands of pagans or of catechumens not in the last stage of preparation for baptism.§ This discipline was still in more than nominal operation when Theodoret wrote his dialogues entitled *Eranistes* (c. 447 A.D.).||

The formula of the Eucharist was the most closely guarded

* THEOLOGY, October, 1933, p. 198 *sqq.*

† Bonn, 1926. The influence of this book is very marked—*e.g.*, in certain parts of *Liturgy and Worship*.

‡ At Alexandria we first hear of the Catechetical School with the appointment of Pantænus as its head about this time.

§ P.G. 33. 565.

|| P.G. 83. 168. Q. "What do you call the sacrificed gift before the priest's epiclesis?" A. "I cannot say openly, for there are probably some here who have not been initiated." Q. "Then answer enigmatically." A. "Food from certain seeds."

of Christian secrets, and whatever indiscretions there may have been in conversation and practice, third- and fourth-century writers usually avoid direct statements about it. Apart from the invaluable and surprising exception of the "Liturgy" in St. Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*, written at Rome c. A.D. 220, we are entirely without actual texts of the liturgy from the first three centuries of its celebration.* Even for the fourth century the texts of the period itself are only four—from Egypt the Sacramentary of Serapion (c. A.D. 360) and the fragment of a liturgy from the Dêr Balyzeh papyrus (c. A.D. 400); from Syria the "Clementine liturgy" of *Apostolic Constitutions*, Bk. VIII. (c. A.D. 375), which needs cautious handling; and that of the *Testament of Our Lord* from Syria or Asia Minor (c. A.D. 400). No extant text of any of the present Eastern rites goes back beyond c. A.D. 800, and their oldest formularies, the anaphoræ of "St. James" and "St. Basil," have undergone extensive revision since the sixth century, as can be proved from earlier citations, though both still contain material of great antiquity. It is possible to reconstruct from our materials considerable parts of the rites of the fourth century, but it has to be remembered that this was the period of rapid liturgical development when the Church's changed legal status naturally wrought profound changes in her public worship, and in which the development and formulation of theology had its own effects upon the liturgy. Inference from these reconstructed rites to the period before Nicea has its dangers.

It is clear that the liturgical evidence is in urgent need of supplement. Fortunately, behind strictly liturgical history there is always another history, that of eucharistic theology, and on this the sermons and treatises which the Fathers addressed to the faithful were necessarily less reserved. Whether *lex orandi statuit legem credendi* or the reverse, inference from one to the other is often legitimate. As Fr. Hebert has reminded us, the dominant Eastern theology of consecration by the illapse of the Spirit and the dominant Western theology of the consecrating Priesthood of the Son are really two distinct ideas, as different as the ethos of the liturgical types which embody them. We need not exaggerate. Nicholas Cabasilas, one of the most polemical anti-Latin advocates of the epiclesis in the fourteenth century, repeatedly affirms that the Son is the true Priest of every liturgy.† St. Thomas, whose exposition of transubstantiation as effected in *ultimo instanti prolationis* of the Dominical Words‡ is authoritative in the West, cites

* The prayers of the *Didache* ix. and x., if they are to be taken seriously, seem to be for the Agape.

† E.g., Ἐρμηνεῖα τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας, 49. P.G. 150. 477.

‡ S. Th., iii. 75. 7.

Paschasius that this mystery is effected "by the word of the Creator and the power of the Holy Ghost" * with the fullest approval. But their very combination of the two ideas only emphasizes the essential duality. Each theologian holds both doctrines, but each frames his own explanation only in terms of one of them.

I may be permitted to say that I came on Fr. Hebert's paper fresh from a survey of all the texts bearing on eucharistic consecration which I could find from the first eight centuries. I know no statement which more justly and pointedly presents the *sum* of patristic teaching on this matter than does Fr. Hebert's, even—and this is remarkable—in the Fathers themselves. The duality and also the balance of these two ideas seem to us now of the utmost importance to eucharistic theology. Yet though some of the classical theologians of the fourth century were aware of a dual operation in the Eucharist, they would seem in this to be innovators on the ante-Nicenes and to have taught it, as it were, confusedly, and with no attempt at a resolution. Writers like St. John Chrysostom or St. Ambrose ascribe consecration now to the Son and now to the Spirit, now to the Words of Institution and now to the Invocation of the Spirit, without ever, so far as I have observed, setting the two notions side by side or gaining a clear combination of ideas.

It is possible to detect behind this hesitation a particular disturbance in the history of theology, and with the clue thus afforded to trace the two ideas to separate sources. It may even be possible to suggest which is original and which is intrusive. But it is necessary first to examine closely the evidence of the only extant ante-Nicene consecration prayer and to divest the epiclesis of a fictitious ancestry imposed upon it by Lietzmann.

The points to be raised will fall under four heads: (1) Did the epiclesis in the "Liturgy of Hippolytus" stand in that prayer as it came from Hippolytus' own pen? (2) The early Syrian evidence on the theology of consecration. (3) The non-Syrian evidence. (4) The early history of the epiclesis.

I.—THE EPICLESIS IN HIPPOLYTUS

Fr. Hebert has englished that part of the "Liturgy of Hippolytus" with which we are here concerned thus:

" . . . Do this in remembrance of Me. Wherefore, having in remembrance his death and resurrection, we offer to thee the

* *Ibid.*, iii. 82. 5.

bread and the cup, giving thanks to thee that thou hast counted us worthy to stand before thee and perform our priestly ministry. And we pray (thee) to send thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of thy holy church, (and) uniting it* in one, grant to all thy holy ones who receive unto fulness of the Holy Spirit for the confirmation of faith in truth, that we may praise and glorify thee, through thy servant Jesus Christ. . . .”

By a singularly beautiful interpretation of the clause italicized, Fr. Hebert has felt authorized to conclude that “the epiclesis in the earliest text in which it occurs is not ‘consecratory’ at all.” His argument is that “the offertory gifts would be thought of as offered by the faithful severally and would be spoken of in the plural as ‘oblations.’” Thus “the true meaning must be that it is *the Church herself that is offered up.*” It is with real regret that one abandons so touching an idea. But five times over in this document is προσφορά (sing.) used unmistakably of the eucharistic gifts. I may cite the offertory rubric immediately before this prayer, where the Sahidic version has transliterated the word: “Let the deacons bring to (the bishop) the *prosphora*. And having laid his hand upon the *prosphora* with the presbyters . . .”† Προσφορά is found with this sense in other third-century writers also. The fourth century rather tended to substitute θυσία (not, of course, unknown before).

There is, therefore, little real doubt that the invocation in this text of Hippolytus refers to the elements. It is not strictly consecratory, but if this is what Hippolytus wrote, if an invocation with whatever force was traditional at this point of the rite at Rome (of all places) c. 220 A.D., then *cadit quæstio historica*. Some form of epiclesis is primordial and universal. But the case is not quite so simple as all that.

The text of Hippolytus has come down in a sadly battered condition. About one-fifteenth of the original Greek can be reconstructed from two later Greek adaptations and from Greek words preserved by the Coptic versions. For the rest we depend on documents in Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, and Arabic, all to some extent defective and some of them heavily interpolated and adapted. There is as yet no critical text of the whole treatise, but such collations of parts of the *Tradition* as have been put out in review articles have revealed some disturbing facts. Dom Capelle, for instance, seems to have convicted every one of the extant authorities of making *independently* of each other a not inconsiderable addition to the

* N.B.—“It” is in no text of the original.

† Horner, *Statutes of the Apostles*, p. 307. I have verified from the only known MS., B.M. Or. 1320, that the word is singular in the Sahidic, *te-prosphora*.

baptismal rite of Hippolytus in order to bring it into line with fourth-century practice.* And Dom Connolly has shewn reason to believe that even the usually well-behaved Latin version has similarly tampered with Hippolytus' creed.† It is clear that in considering the evidence of this document we must be on our guard against later manipulations of its text. The only collation of its anaphora available is that of Lietzmann, which is unfortunately defective and is accompanied by a reconstruction of the original Greek which contains at least one mistranslation. In a matter of such moment for the history of the Eucharist it is worth while examining the evidence with care.

The texts available for the reconstruction of this passage are four: (1) A bald Latin version of Hippolytus' Greek, usually accounted the best text. I cite this as L, from Hauler's edition, *Fragmenta Didascalicæ Apostolorum*, Leipzig, 1900, p. 107. (2) An Ethiopic version of an Arabic version (? of a Coptic version) of the original Greek, which has suffered a little in transit. When collated it gives approximately the same text as the Latin, and I have not reproduced it here.‡ (3) The *Testament of Our Lord*, a Syriac translation of a lost Greek expansion of Hippolytus' treatise. The accuracy of the Syriac translator can be controlled by an Ethiopic version descending independently from the lost Greek *Test.* I cite the Syriac as T from Rahmani's edition, Mainz, 1899, pp. 42-44. There is an English translation by Cooper and Maclean, 1904. The liturgy only of the Ethiopic *Test.* has been published by Bishop Harden (*J.T.S.*, xxiii., p. 44 *sqq.*). For some reason Lietzmann omits the readings of T at the critical point, though he uses it elsewhere. (4) The only Greek document is the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Bk. VIII., which, as always, needs to be used with caution. Its author was equipped with a perverse ingenuity in the misuse of his sources which has to be studied to be adequately appreciated. In this case he has fused the text of Hippolytus with that of a Syrian rite (c. A.D. 375), and probably with phrases of his own invention. I cite this as A from the edition of F. X. Funk, Paderborn, 1905, I., p. 508 *sq.*

With these it will be convenient to have Lietzmann's reconstruction of Hippolytus' Greek for reference, noting only that it is partly conjectural and that the word *θυσίαν* is certainly wrong.

* *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, April, 1933, p. 146 *sq.*

† *J.T.S.*, xxv., p. 131 *sqq.*

‡ Horner, *op. cit.*, p. 140, but cf. p. 373.

L.

T.

Memores igitur mortis et resurrectionis ejus offerimus tibi panem et calicem gratias tibi agentes quia nos dignos habuisti adstare coram te et tibi ministrare. Et petimus ut mittas spiritum tuum sanctum in oblationem sanctæ ecclesiæ; in unum congregans des omnibus qui percipiunt sanctis in repletionem spiritus sancti ad confirmationem fidei in veritatem ut te laudamus, etc.

Therefore, mindful of thy death and thy resurrection, we offer to thee the bread and the cup, giving thanks to thee . . . that thou hast counted us worthy to stand before thee and perform our priestly ministry to thee. . . . Grant that all who partake [and receive] of thy holy things may be made one with thee, that they may be fulfilled with the Holy Spirit to the confirmation of faith in truth, that they may praise thee, etc.

LIETZMANN (pp. 57 and 80).

Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ προσφέρομέν σοι τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον εὐχαριστοῦντές σοι ἐφ' οἷς κατηξίωσας ἡμᾶς ἔστανται ἐνώπιον σοῦ καὶ iερατεύειν σοι· καὶ ἀξιοῦμέν σε ὅπως καταπέμψῃς τὸ ἄγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν τῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας <ἢν> ἐνώσας δοίης πᾶσι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἀγίοις εἰς πλήρωσιν πνεύματος ἀγίου πρὸς βεβαιώσιν πίστεως ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἵνα σε αἰνέσωμεν κτλ.

Ap. Const., viii. 12, 38.—Mindful therefore of his passion and death and resurrection from the dead and ascension into heaven and his future second coming, wherein he shall come with glory and power to judge the living and the dead and to reward every man according to his works, we offer unto thee (our) King and God according to his ordinance this bread and this cup, giving thanks to thee through him that thou hast counted us worthy to stand before thee and perform our priestly ministry to thee. And we beseech thee that (ἀξιοῦμέν σε ὅπως) thou wouldest graciously behold these gifts that lie before thee, O God that lackest for nothing, and be well-pleased with them for the honour of thy Christ: And send down (καταπέμψῃς) thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, upon this sacrifice (θυσίαν), that he may make (or shew) this bread the Body of thy Christ and this cup the Blood of thy Christ (ὅπως αποφήνῃς τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου), that they who partake of it may be strengthened (βεβαιωθῶσιν) unto piety, may receive the remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his deceits, may be filled with the Holy Ghost, may receive everlasting life, etc.

The phrases italicized in A come from Hippolytus; those underlined are found in the present "Liturgy of St. James," and can in part be proved to have stood in the fourth century rite of Jerusalem—i.e., they are certainly Syrian. A text which presents such a mosaic of sources can be used only as con-

firmatory evidence, and the main issue lies between L and T. Both Connolly and Capelle recognize these as the two best versions we have for other parts of the text. L is generally reckoned the better, chiefly as being a version of Hippolytus' treatise itself, while T interpolates a great deal of its own. But as Dom Capelle has noted on the baptismal rite, this redactor is as a rule careful to preserve the very words of his source so far as possible, while farcing them freely with his own inventions. And in some other passages T has preserved occasional authentic readings which L has corrupted. Both L and T date from about A.D. 400, and it is likely that both were made from exemplars of Eastern origin. We may now examine their variants.

(1) L: "His death and resurrection." T: "Thy death and thy resurrection." The prayer is addressed to the Father, and L is supported by A. Against this, the Dér Balyzeh liturgy (c. A.D. 400), also addressed to the Father, has "thy death and thy resurrection," and so also an Egyptian amulet (Lietzmann, p. 55). And the Syriac "St. James," often more archaic than the Greek, also has "thy death and thy resurrection" against the more modernized Greek's "his death and resurrection." The rule that eucharistic prayer should be addressed to the Father began to be more strictly enforced about the end of the fourth century,* but before that abrupt changes of address seem to have been found tolerable (cf. the *Gloria in excelsis*, which goes back at least to the third century). So far as the evidence goes, then, either L or T might be right here, but T has the more archaic ring. This will prove a point of some importance when we examine the early Roman theology of consecration.

(2) L: "We beseech thee." A: ἀξιοῦμέν σε ὅπως. We need not doubt that A verbally reproduces Hippolytus in these three words. The normal Eastern opening of the epiclesis is δεόμεθα καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν, but "St. James" (significantly) turns the whole phrase differently. ἀξιοῦμέν σε δέσποτα is found as the opening of a petition in the Roman *Ep. of Clement* (§ 59), c. A.D. 96, and is possibly a traditional Roman liturgical phrase. T's "Grant" corresponds to L's *des*, not to *petimus*. After "ministry to thee" T inserts a long passage not dependent on Hippolytus, the later clauses of which each begin with "Grant," and he thus links up his interpolation with the resumed text of Hippolytus, omitting ἀξιοῦμέν σε ὅπως, amongst other things.

(3) T: "Partake and receive." "And receive" is not in the Ethiopic version of T, and is therefore due to the Syriac translator, not to his Greek original. It is a common trick of

* E.g., by the Councils of Hippo, A.D. 393, and Carthage, A.D. 397.

Syriac versions to represent one word by two Syriac synonyms.

(4) L: "All thy holy ones who partake." T: "All who partake of thy holy things." T reflects *āyīwū* for *āyīoū*. Neither the Ethiopic nor A is of any assistance. T is a little more natural and slightly better Greek, but L as the "harder reading" may be allowed to stand.

(5) We come now to the crux. Where L has an epiclesis and a prayer for the communicants, T has the latter only. If L is right, T, an Eastern liturgy (c. A.D. 400), not only has no epiclesis, but has deliberately omitted one which stood in a source which it generally follows very exactly. This is the more astonishing in that T is particularly interested in the Person of the Holy Ghost, whom it introduces apparently gratuitously at the most unexpected points—e.g., in its formula for administering Communion: "The Body of Jesus Christ the Holy Spirit, for the health of soul and body."* On the other hand, T's prayer for the communicants runs more smoothly and makes better sense than L's. I may be prejudiced, but L seems very incoherent with its double reference to "the Spirit," and *congregans* governing nothing at all. It is significant that Lietzmann only gets it into Greek by supplying *ῆν*, which none of the four texts warrants. What I suggest has happened is that Hippolytus wrote something like *ἀξιοῦμέν σε ὅπως αὐτούς σοι ἐνώσας διδῷς πᾶσιν κτλ.*, as in T. Later, someone accustomed to use an epiclesis brought Hippolytus "up to date" by replacing *αὐτούς σοι* with an epiclesis, leaving *ἐνώσας* in the air. Hence the incoherence visible in the bald Latin version (and also in the Ethiopic) made from the interpolated recension. It is by such inadequate sutures that early interpolators often betray themselves. The words *ἀξιοῦμέν σε ὅπως* coming just at that point would offer a temptation to anyone disposed to make the "obviously necessary" addition.

When we look at A something of the same kind is visible. We have seen that *ἀξιοῦμέν σε ὅπως* is probably from Hippolytus. It is precisely at this point, *at the opening of L's epiclesis*, that A deserts L and proceeds to frame his epiclesis from other sources. The epiclesis over, A immediately returns to L's text with the prayer for *βεβαιώσις*. Lietzmann, by mistranslating L's *oblationem* (the Ethiopic also, "oblation,") as *θυσίαν* instead of *προσφοράν*, and by taking L's *mittas* "send," (Ethiopic also, "send,") as the equivalent of A's "send down," has traced a continuance of the influence of L throughout the epiclesis of A. In fact, all they have in common are the words "send"

* T., ii. 10, ed. cit., p. 132. This reflects an ancient confusion we shall meet again.

and "thy Holy Spirit," without which no epiclesis could be constructed at all. Every single word distinctive of L's phrasing at this point is simply not there in A. It would seem that A found no model for its epiclesis in its text of Hippolytus, and for what its evidence is worth witnesses *against* the clause.

The theory of an interpolation has at least the merit of accounting for all the textual phenomena. When we come to examine other early Roman evidence, including that of Hippolytus himself, such a conclusion will, I hope, be strongly fortified. Here it suffices to remark that in treating elsewhere of the Blessed Trinity Hippolytus deliberately refuses to apply to the Holy Ghost the word "Person" of the Godhead.* It was surely a little paradoxical of Lietzmann to father the consecratory epiclesis of the Spirit on a teacher who was actually excommunicated for *ditheism*.

Without this clause the order of Hippolytus' prayer will run: Institution, Anamnesis, Oblation, Prayer for the Communicants. This is still the order of the Roman Canon. It may be forcing upon the thought of Hippolytus the conception of a later age to suggest that he regarded the Words of Institution as "consecratory" rigidly in the mediæval sense. But at least it would seem that at the opening of the third century the subsequent Western *practice* of consecration was already "the Apostolic tradition" in the city.

II.—THE EARLY SYRIAN THEOLOGY OF CONSECRATION

The early Syrian evidence on this head will be found to stand entirely apart from that of other regions, and may conveniently be taken separately.

The earliest serious evidence—I speak under correction—for a consecratory epiclesis of the Spirit is found in the *Apostolic Didascalia*, a Catholic document from Syria, perhaps from Palestine, which its latest editor, Dom Connolly, would date before rather than after A.D. 250. This makes the statement that "the Eucharist through the Spirit is accepted and sanctified," and orders, "offer an acceptable Eucharist . . . pure bread made with fire and sanctified with invocations."† Dom Connolly, for his own part, refuses "to put two and two together," to see here a reference to a consecratory epiclesis of the Spirit. But it is at least evident that we are here moving

* In God "two Persons," πρόσωπα δύο, οἰκονομίᾳ δὲ τρίτην τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος. *Contra Noetum.*, 14.

† *Didascalia*, vi. 21. 2 and vi. 22. 2, ed. Connolly, 1929, pp. 244 and 252.

within the circle of those ideas which would directly give rise to such an epiclesis.

The Gnostic *Acts of Judas Thomas*, likewise Syrian and of the third century, contain the following formula in an account of a Eucharist: "Come, perfect pity; come, communion of the male [κοινωνία τοῦ ἄρρενος—i.e., Consort of God the Father]; come, thou (fem.) that understandest the mysteries of the Chosen One [i.e., of Jesus] . . . the holy dove that hast brought forth twin young [i.e., Jesus and Judas Thomas]; come, hidden Mother . . . come and communicate with us in this Eucharist which we make in *thy* name and in the Agape wherein we are come together to invoke thee [or 'at thy call,' ἐπὶ τῇ κλήσει σου]."^{*} The Holy Ghost is "the Mother" of Jesus in the Syrian heretic gospel "of the Hebrews" and "our Mother" according to the orthodox Syrian Aphraates (*Dem.*, x. 10), and the symbolism of the dove (the emblem, be it noted, of the Syrian Mother-goddess Astarte-Atargatis) fixes the application. This invocation is immediately preceded by another: "Jesu, who hast deemed us worthy to partake of the Eucharist of thy holy Body and Blood, lo, we dare to come to thy Eucharist and to call upon (ἐπικαλεῖσθαι) thy holy name. Come and communicate with us." There are here two invocations, neither of them in form, but both seemingly by intention consecratory, and that to the Third Person is considerably more developed and definite. It is worth noting that an almost exactly similar formula is prescribed for baptism[†] and that in a subsequent description of the Eucharist the "Name of the Mother" is invoked before "the Name of Jesus."[‡] It is unfair to infer from this farrago the practice of the contemporary Syrian orthodox, but it may witness to ideas then in the air in Syria.

The orthodox dialogue *De Recta in Deum Fide*, also Syrian (c. A.D. 300), says vaguely that "the Spirit comes upon the Eucharist" (ἐρχεται ἐπὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας).[§] It may or may not be significant that the remark is put into the mouth of the heretical interlocutor.

This is not much from the first three centuries, but so far as I have been able to discover these are the only passages in the whole of the ante-Nicene literature, Syrian or non-Syrian, which suggest any operation of the Spirit in the Eucharist.^{||}

The first testimony to the consecratory epiclesis of the Spirit among the Orthodox whose force is universally allowed also comes from this region. Explaining the liturgy to the newly baptized in A.D. 348, St. Cyril of Jerusalem tells them:

* Bonnet-Lipsius, *Acta Apocrypha Apostolorum*, ii. 2, p. 166. † *Ibid.*, p. 142.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

§ Adamantius, ii. 8, ed. Backhuysen, p. 74.

|| An apparent parallel in St. Cyprian will be noted later.

"We call upon God, the lover of men, to send the Holy Spirit upon the elements, that he may make (*ποιήσῃ*) the bread the Body of Christ and the wine the Blood of Christ."* In an explanation of the Mass of the Faithful to those who had just attended it for the first time verbal echoes of the liturgy are to be expected, and St. Cyril has here reproduced almost word for word the epiclesis formula taken for granted at Jerusalem in his day. We may note that with the substitution of the definite word "make" for *ἀποφήνῃ*, it is the same as the operative clause in the epiclesis of *Ap. Const.* viii. above. St. Cyril shows no hesitation about the theology of consecration. Three times he attributes it to the Spirit, never to the Son. It is hard to see how anyone habitually using "St. James" could conceive the matter otherwise. A.D. 350, then, or earlier, is the *terminus ad quem* for the full development of consecration by the epiclesis of the Spirit ("make this bread the Body") in Syria. This is *earlier* than those apparently less forceful terms *ἀποφαίνειν*, *ἀποδείκνυαι*, which might otherwise suggest a gradual intensification of the consecratory sense of the epiclesis. It may be noted in passing that Cyril's general theology of the Holy Ghost is greatly in advance of that of most of his contemporaries among the orthodox.

Greek was not the only theological language of Syria. The gap between St. Cyril and the next Greek documents is roughly bridged by the two Syriac writers, Aphraates (c. A.D. 340) and St. Ephraem (*ob.* A.D. 373). Of the first we need only say that he is not a professed theologian but a moralist, and that his rustic ideas probably represent the third century better than his own time. Of all his references to the Eucharist or to the Holy Ghost none connects the two in any way, though he refers repeatedly to the Spirit's operation in baptism. In one passage† he seems to refer consecration to the Words of Institution, but vaguely. His general theology of the Holy Ghost is meagre and at times distinctly curious,‡ but he seems clear that the Spirit is God. St. Ephraem is, on the contrary, more than once explicit on the epiclesis—e.g., "By the prayer of the priest and the coming of the Holy Ghost the bread becomes the Body and the wine the

* *Cat.*, 23. 7; P.G. 33. 1113. Cf. the present epiclesis of "St. James": "O Lord, the lover of men . . . send thine all-holy Spirit . . . upon the elements . . . that he may make (*ποιήσῃ*) this bread the holy Body of Christ and this cup the precious Blood of Christ." Brightman (L.E.W., *App. B*) has reconstructed from St. Cyril an epiclesis whose verbal identity with "St. James" cannot be accidental.

† *Demonstr.*, xii. 6. Graffin, *Pat. Syr.*, I. 1, p. 516.

‡ At the resurrection the Holy Ghost will stand outside the tombs of the righteous to cast upon them their glorified bodies as they emerge at the trumpet's signal (*Dem.*, 8. 4). So in the Syrian *Assumption of Mary* the Holy Ghost resurrects those Apostles who died before that event in order that they may be present, explaining, "Do not think that this is now the resurrection," but a purely temporary emergency. James, *Apocryphal N.T.*, p. 203.

Blood.”* But he has a remarkable passage which sets out a rather different view. Speaking of the Last Supper he says: “. . . He blessed it, made over it the sign of the Cross, consecrated it in the Name of the Father and of the Holy Ghost. . . . He called the bread his living Body and filled it with Himself and *with the Holy Spirit.*”† This is the precise reverse of consecration *by* the Spirit. He follows this up with: “This is my Body, and whoever eats it with faith eats with it the fire of the Divine Spirit.” The Syriac Church in the person of its most distinguished son clearly found it hard to express just what was involved in consecration by the Spirit.

We come now to a liturgy which has at times enjoyed more honour than it deserves, that of *Ap. Const.* viii., whose epiclesis we have already examined. Turner’s reasons for regarding the author as a full-blown Arian carry conviction; whether he represents Antioch (c. 375) or Cæsarea (c. A.D. 350) is perhaps more doubtful. The reconstitution of the actual wording of the Syrian liturgy of his day from this writer is always a rather precarious business where we cannot check him by other documents, but St. Cyril and “St. James” guarantee that he has kept strictly to the *type* of the fourth-century Syrian epiclesis. Attention centres on the word *ἀποφήνη*, “that the Spirit may make (*or show*) this bread to be the Body of thy Christ.” Does this represent the attempt of the “Constitutor” to find a middle term between his sources, the Syrian rite which had and “Hippolytus” which had *not* a consecratory epiclesis? This attractive explanation is improbable; such a term is found elsewhere. Not only does the “Liturgy of St. Basil” still retain the parallel *ἀναδεῖξαι* at this point, but *ἀνάδειξις* is St. Basil’s own word for the “consecration” of the Eucharist.‡ St. Isidore of Pelusium in Egypt (c. A.D. 415) actually uses *ἀποφαίνειν* of eucharistic consecration by the Holy Ghost,§ a usage which seems to be further attested in Egypt by Theophilus of Alexandria’s *Paschal Letter* for A.D. 402 preserved by St. Jerome.|| It is thus reasonable to suppose that in *ἀποφήνη* *Ap. Const.* has preserved the actual word used in some fourth-century Syrian epiclesis. But it must be observed that no difference of force between such words and St. Cyril’s *ποιεῖν* is *necessarily* to be understood. In classical Greek, in the *koiné* and in the Fathers *ἀνα-* or *ἀπο-*

* *Opp. Scti. Ephraemi*, ed. Lamy, I., p. 20.

† Cited Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*, E.T. ii., 1914, p. 215. Tixeront does not remark how curious these expressions are.

‡ *De Sptu. Scto.*, 27. 66.

§ Isidore, *Ep.*, I. 109. P.G. τὸ πανάγιον πνεῦμα . . . τὸν ἄρτον τὸν κοινὸν σῶμα . . . *ἀποφαῖνον*.

|| Jerome, *Ep.*, 98. 15. P.L. 22. 801. *Panem Dominicum quo Salvatoris corpus ostenditur . . . per invocationem et adventum Sancti Spiritus.* St. Jerome has not necessarily rightly caught Theophilus’ meaning in translating *ἀποφαίνειν* = *ostenditur*.

δείκνυμι and *ἀποφαίνω* all mean "make" just as well as "shew."* But what we can say is that such formulæ would seem to those who need them *ambiguous* to a certain extent; they did leave room for a line of thought which St. Cyril's word "make" really excludes.

It is in complete accord with this that St. John Chrysostom, the great *Doctor Eucharisticus* of Antioch in the age of *Ap. Const.* viii., appears to shew a hesitation in his eucharistic theology which contrasts with St. Cyril's definiteness. On occasion he can say that the priest at the altar holds the place of Christ. "Christ (by the Priest) recites 'This is My Body.' These words transform the elements."† It would seem hard to be less equivocal than that. Yet he can also say of the priest: ". . . When he calls the Holy Spirit (*κάλη*) and consummates (*ἐπιτέλη*) the most dread sacrifice."‡ Are there here two ideas? If there are, Chrysostom himself seems scarcely to have been aware of it. He never sets them side by side to combine or to distinguish them.

In the fifth-century Syrian writers, at all events, the two ideas are kept sharply distinct. Some, like St. Nilus and the Nestorian Narsai, recognize only the consecratory action of the Spirit. Others, like the Pseudo-Areopagite§ and Chrysostom's great successor at Antioch, the Monophysite Severus, make no mention of the epiclesis, and attribute the *τελείωσις* of the mysteries to the *Dominical Words*. Severus is no less explicit than his predecessor: "The priest who stands before the altar . . . pronouncing his words in the person of Christ, says over the bread 'This is My Body.' . . . Accordingly it is Christ who still even now offers, and the power of his divine words perfects the things provided so that they may become his Body and Blood."|| A century and a half after Cyril of Jerusalem, therefore, his teaching was not universally accepted even in Syria.

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

* Erasmus took *ἀναδεῖξαι* in the "Liturgy of St. Basil" as "shew" and commented on the difference from other Eastern liturgies, for which he was taken to task by the Jesuit Ducas. St. Robert Bellarmine also tried to make controversial capital against the Byzantines out of the word, and was decisively refuted by Le Brun, Renaudot, and other Latins.

† *De Prod. Judas Homil.*, i. 6. P.G. 49. 389. *τοῦτο τὸ ρῆμα μεταρρυθμίζει τὰ προκείμενα*. For similar teaching, cf., e.g., in *Matt. Hom.*, 50. 3; 81. 5 (P.G. 58. 507 and 714) in *2 Tim. Hom.*, 2. 4 (P.G. 62. 612).

‡ *De Sacerdotio*, 6. 4; P.G. 48. 641; cf. *ibid.*, 3. 4; *de Scio. Pentec. Hom.*, i. 4, etc.

§ Brightman, L.E.W., *App. E.*

|| E. W. Brooks, *The Sixth Book of Select Letters of Severus of Antioch*, ii. 2, p. 237.

(To be continued.)

VALUES IN RECENT EVANGELISTIC MOVEMENTS

WE have witnessed in these post-war years a great uprising of evangelistic movements. No one can doubt the need of them. We have been through very lean years. But there are now many signs of reaction and revival. Take this list of societies recently formed, and all largely evangelistic: the Anglo-Catholic Congress Movement, Toc H, the Industrial Christian Fellowship, Buchman's Groups. The purpose of this article is not to criticize but to analyze their positive values by some account of the *history*, the *message*, the *methods*, and the *spirit* of each, that by a comparison of them we may be able to recognize the signs of revival, prepare ourselves to take our part in it, and to foster it. In addition to the above one cannot ignore the corresponding movements on the Continent, and something must also be said about the Anglican-Evangelical Group and the Way of Renewal.

Surely the very length and the variety of this list is noteworthy. These societies do not spring out of nothing to do nothing. The supply exists because there is a demand for them. Men are converted because they are convertible: they organize themselves, and the organizations grow because other men are convertible.

THE A.C.C.

HISTORY.—The first Congress was in 1920. It surprised everyone by its enthusiasm, numbers, and its parade of theological learning. It was held in the Albert Hall and ran concurrently with the Lambeth Conference, on the members of which its witness had a profound effect. It was a dramatic moment in our Church's history, when the traditionalist caution of our spiritual fathers found itself side by side with revolutionary enthusiasm. 1920 was an *annus mirabilis*. Not only Lambeth and its noble declaration on reunion and the first Congress with its astonishing declaration of the strength of Catholicity in the Church of England, but also our first attempts at autonomy by the National Assembly, and the eirenicon of Cuddesdon under Bishop Burge with its effort to heal our divisions on the basis of frank recognition of whatever proved spiritually valuable, all belong to that year. So does THEOLOGY and other journalistic efforts. The A.C.C. is not a thing of solitary significance.

MESSAGE.—The message of the A.C.C. rises out of its history. It is twofold. Firstly, the setting forth of the Faith. In this the A.C.C. is the heir of the Tractarians and of Lux Mundi.

The proclamation of God's scheme of salvation has proved its power as a converting force in sermons, in missions, and in the learned papers of the Congresses. Even in penny tracts short treatises of stiff theology in popular language have taken the place of the old-fashioned pious sentimental stories as agents of conversion.

The second emphasis in the message of the Congresses is a sequel of the first. A doctrine of God necessitates a doctrine of man and of the meaning and use of God's creatures. The Tractarians were followed in logical development by ritualistic missions in slums or by the Christian Social Union, which we shall meet again in the I.C.F. In the A.C.C. we find again this emphasis in treatises, in schools of sociology and a committee on housing. Much of the message of the Tractarians was in their lives. The Congresses, in spite of their unfortunate geographical connection with London with its general atmosphere of tawdry flippancy, have also made appeal for surrender and consecration, secular and "religious."

METHODS.—The Congresses have met in secular places rather than in churches. But the secular places have been given an ecclesiastical decor. There has been a note of youthfulness about the meetings. In them street and university find themselves congenial bedfellows in a mixture of the dramatic and the academic. The importance and influence of laymen in the movement is remarkable.

SPIRITUAL VALUES.—The emphasis has been on the full revelation of God through Jesus Christ; but that leading to a Catholic humanism. Life in all its positive shewings has been set forth as the service and worship of God.

The A.C.C. movement has its counterparts abroad, where the contest between God and this world is much more acute and clear-cut than in this happy land. Abroad we have the restatement of scholastic theology used as an evangelistic force and the preaching of a sociology God-centred instead of humanist; in Lutheranism, a new emphasis on religious values. M. Jacques Maritain, M. Berdiaev, and Dr. Barth are representative of the different elements.

There is also the appeal to the Religious orders for the witness and power of Christian asceticism. Against the love of this world is set the love of God. As representative of this the Pope has declared St. John of the Cross a Doctor of the Church, whereby he advertises the appeal of the pure love of God and that in a most extreme form, in the hope that it may produce that vigour of surrendered life which can do for this generation something of what Athanasius did for his, when he hurled the Life of St. Anthony against the decadent humanism of Imperial society.

TOC H

HISTORY.—Toc H was born of the experience of a man (Padre Clayton) who combined the following qualities in the following circumstances, and each is of importance in the understanding of the result.

The man was an Anglican, of Catholic traditions, an Australian by birth, by education a first at Oxford, a priest, a great lover of his fellow men, and last but not least a poet. He got his experience in charge of a soldiers' house of recreation at the main centre of assembly for all those engaged on the most dramatic, tragic, and heroic front of the war, the salient of Ypres. In war men live at a higher level of emotion and achievement than in peace. Life will be more sordid and beastly, as many have made it their business to point out; but it will also shew itself in fuller fellowship and sacrifice. It was the vocation and glory of Toc H in the general post-war slump to reorganize itself that by the grace of God some visions of those high peaks of fellowship and service might act as beacons of hope and allure to the new generations of youth fatefully born into these flat, dreary wastes of peace.

MESSAGE.—Toc H was founded by a poet, who lived his poetry even more than he wrote it. Its message, then, is not in words, but in a lyricism of lives lived in fellowship and service. Doubtless most of its members are very bad poems. But let not him criticize who is but a bit of pointless, dull, confused, ungrammatical prose. Thus Toc H "spreads the Gospel without preaching it." Its message is by example. I quote its "Main Resolution":

"Remembering with gratitude how God used the old House to bring home to multitudes of men that behind the ebb and flow of things temporal stand the eternal realities, and to send them forth strengthened to fight at all costs for the setting up of His Kingdom upon Earth; we pledge ourselves to strive:

"To listen now and always for the voice of God.

"To know His Will revealed in Christ and to do it fearlessly, reckoning nothing of the world's opinion on its successes for ourselves or this our family, and towards this end.

"To think fairly, to love widely, to witness humbly, to build bravely."

METHODS.—“The Four Points of our Compass:

"1. Fellowship: To found a series of self-supporting Branches and Groups for the fostering of a new spirit between man and man.

"2. Service: To establish Centres throughout the country and overseas, whence the elder may serve the younger, and the friendly the lonely.

"3. Fair-mindedness: To bring the expert to the group, to hear him and ask him questions; to listen hospitably and humbly to Everyman's story, and to help the truth to prevail.

"4. The Kingdom of God: To spread the Gospel without preaching it."

So Toc H is organized outside the Churches; but that not for a common minimum but on a basis of fellowship for the sharing of the maximum of each one's particular best.

In Toc H a man sees a new spirit of living in fellowship and service. A lay "pilot" is ready to help him to find the secret of that new spirit in God. He is then handed on to the padre of his particular choice for instruction in the way of life and the means of grace. Toc H is a youth movement.

SPIRITUAL VALUES.—Much has been already said under the former headings. There remains its spirit of poverty. Its meetings are held on a basis of absolute equality. "All rank abandon ye who enter here" is a notice in all Toc H rooms. This spirit of poverty is also kept in material things. The meeting places are often sheds and attics, furnished and kept by the members; and the same note of simplicity is rigorously kept in amusements, refreshments and subscriptions. Poverty of the will is expressed by obedience. Each unit of Toc H has an officer called a "job-master." There is a fine spirit of response to his demands for personal service. In some cases this spirit of poverty rises to most heroic levels.

THE I.C.F.

HISTORY.—The I.C.F. came into existence out of the fusion of the Christian Social Union and the "Navvy Mission."

MESSAGE.—Its message is social. But it is interesting to note that under the pressure of experience it is becoming much more theological. For, as Berdiaev teaches, humanism ends in the destruction of man's individuality. But the Fatherhood of God means the sonship and worth of each man. Again the modern world has ceased to believe in an automatic progress by evolution. So the I.C.F. is driven back into preaching God as Saviour. Its message is a Christian humanism.

METHODS.—The I.C.F. does a great deal of propaganda of various kinds. Its biggest evangelistic work it does by "Crusades." These Crusades are conducted mostly outside Churches and by open-air meetings. It has evolved a technique of open-air meetings that is most significant. Here are no

banners, flares, bands, loud hymns or prayers, nor shoutings of salvation. A quiet, ordinarily dressed man or woman stands on his platform surrounded by a small group of ordinary folk, who are there to give him a start. Anyone can come and listen without embarrassment or feeling that he is being angled for. The speaker argues quietly, invites questions and answers civilly and candidly. The method may be compared to a dry wine as opposed to a sweet one. Its purpose is not primarily to convert but to remove prejudices and hindrances. It is a propaganda behind the lines of the enemy to destroy his morale rather than an assault on his armies. Ludendorff, though not without prejudice, has expressed his opinion that the late war was won by success in such propaganda rather than by success in arms.

SPIRITUAL VALUES.—The title I.C.F. stresses two qualities of Christian living. "Industrial" marks its interest in the poorer strata of society. To deal with material poverty there must be spiritual poverty also. "Fellowship" marks its emphasis on the modern values of society rather than of individuality. Life is a sharing and a surrender of self, a thing of service, of giving not getting.

BUCHMANISM

HISTORY.—The Groups Movement, like Toc H, is the product of the history of its founder. Buchman was an American Lutheran pastor. He was distressed at the failure of his own ministry and at the general worldliness and poverty of spiritual life throughout American Christianity. In his efforts to find a remedy he came to Keswick, and in a small meeting outside Keswick he found salvation. The effects of that background of U.S.A., modern Lutheranism, and Keswick must always be remembered, especially by those whose traditions are very different, if they desire to disentangle the general spiritual values of the movement from the particularities due to its origins. His cure was by a ruthless destruction of the causes of failure. For Buchman that meant the conquest of fear, a victory over his reserves, shyness and shames. The means of mortification were publicity and absolute obedience to whatever he thought God wanted him to do. His death to sin was followed by an entirely new life of power and knowledge from the Spirit. By sharing his experience with others he gave it to them; his ministry became fruitful; he changed lives.

MESSAGE.—The message of the Groups is by testimony of the sinful life, that has died, and of the new life that has come. The emphasis is laid on the first part; for it is only the thoroughly

mortified who can enter into the fullness of the new life guided by the Spirit of God. Confession of sin is arrived at by self-examination on the four absolutes, honesty, purity, unselfishness, love. Amongst beginners these are usually concerned with the things of the senses, with deadly sins such as dishonest dealing, sexual misdeeds, quarrellings. With the more perfect the purification is in the affections and of venial sins and imperfections. Thus in Buchman's case it was fear, or in Watt's case his enthusiasm for social righteousness had to be purged from motives founded on his own inner frustration and mal-adjustment—that is, from things without real value.

The new life is by guidance of the Holy Spirit, a guidance complete into all departments of life; "a working supernaturalism" Shoemaker calls it. Will this guidance which is so much concerned with things of the senses follow the development of penitence into things of the spirit? Will it move, as it is sought in prayer from particulars to the general, to a diffused confidence in God and a knowledge of His Will communicated one is tempted to say by non-guidance rather than by guidance? Will it be fascinated by the extraordinary phenomena of early stages of spiritual experience and become "illuminist" or develop into a union of will and understanding with God? How far penitence has gone in this development is shewn by two quotations from Professor Grensted. Christian experience is "constituted by a surrender of a kind which makes an absolute demand, its most inclusive characteristics being in relation to ourselves absolute honesty and in relation to others absolute love." And again, "To be free from sin is to be free from pride, in an open honesty of living, which has no hidden shame or reserve because there is no place left where man or God may not enter in and be at home."

METHODS.—The Groups have evolved a set of spiritual exercises. (1) Self-examination by the "four absolutes"; (2) a full confession to another member, followed probably by a public confession, in which, however, proper reticence is observed; (3) a great point is made of restitution and apologies for wrongs done; (4) frankness and readiness in communicating spiritual experience; (5) Bible-reading and quiet time. The first quiet time must be in the morning and means earlier rising. A man is advised to have pen and paper ready that he may make a note of what he is guided to do. (6) Absolute surrender and obedience to guidance: but queer guidances are to be submitted to the judgment of others.

The meetings are held in rooms or halls for people invited. Often hotels are taken for house-parties. The movement is therefore outside Churches. The programme is entirely filled

by testimony, without hymns or prayers except perhaps for a short quiet time and a dismissal. It is all very "dry," to use that metaphor again. The quality of the speaking has also that same attractive "dryness," dry and sparkling, whether it comes from the product of Eton and Christchurch, an American business man, or a Scotch maid-servant. The movement, though it has added a large proportion of elderly men and ministers of different kinds, is largely youthful and lay. By that its message and methods are governed. It is concerned with the earlier stages of religious experience and a minimum of theology. Men testify to that which they know and not to that which they don't. The theory seems to be that a man by his complete purification and the new spirit will be enabled to appreciate the full values of the teaching of any religious denomination, and will quicken its members towards a maximum of experience by his fervour. The doctrine of guidance enables the Groups to receive with readiness any testimony of religious experience of whatever ecclesiastical hue from anyone who produces his credentials that he has passed through the qualifying spiritual exercises.

SPIRITUAL VALUES.—The Groups place first purification and mortification. These are for all: "no one is taken for granted." In penitence emphasis is laid on confession and satisfaction. The contrition of its members varies. The atmosphere is one of attrition rather than contrition; its effects the joy of release rather than the humility of adoration. This may be due to the effects of modern secularism especially in education, so that men are moved by a vision of their own failures and of another's perfections more than by the Vision of God, such as Isaiah describes in his sixth chapter. Isaiah's experience probably means a God-centred upbringing and society. Attrition is the experience of men brought up on the maxim that "the study of mankind is man." The secular surroundings, etc., of a Group meeting tend to the same end. Contrition comes from other experiences of the penitents, which are outside the Groups. But the attrition is magnificently thorough and a good foundation for fuller experience.

It is probable that the confessions frequently repeated in public are more of the nature of satisfaction for past misdeeds, a return due to society for evil done by mending such evils in others, than of pure confession.

Private Prayer.—The private prayer of the Groups consists of three exercises, Bible reading, which is the educational part of prayer, a quiet time for waiting on the Holy Spirit for guidance, and firm resolution to obey. This is both like and unlike meditation as usually taught. Meditation lays the chief

emphasis on the educational side; out of what is learnt man knows the will of God in general, and out of that general knowledge he resolves to govern the particular details of life. The Groups lay more emphasis on the two latter, but more in the form of resolution out of particular than out of general knowledge. This leads to the spiritual values of guidance and obedience.

Guidance is a phenomenon of religious revival. The individualistic history and the method of prayer of the Groups lay them open to the dangers of Illuminism. There are signs that the Groups are aware of the danger. However, it is not my purpose to criticize but to mark values. I note it, therefore, as a sign of religious revival, which lays the emphasis on the need of the supernatural. Education, Housing, a League of Nations, etc., are all good machines for producing a better life. But a stronger life may turn to greater corruption and evil. Its end will depend on absolute purity and honesty and sensitiveness to the will of the Good God.

Guidance and obedience are complementary. There is a military quality about obedience in the Groups. For successful action in certain circumstances, which are like to those of warfare, prompt and unquestioned obedience is necessary. In accordance with the origin of the Groups it takes the form of obedience to an almost individualist interior direction, and it is absolute. There is no limit to surrender.

Mention must be made of the engaging qualities of frankness and simplicity. I close with poverty. The Groups are equalitarian. We are all even sinners in the sight of God. But they add a further quality to their poverty. G. K. Chesterton has told us that St. Francis brought freedom to men caught in the all-embracing system of feudalism by a poverty that made his followers so insignificant that no net could have so small a mesh that such fry could not pass freely through it. In modern society, in which men are caught in a net of prides, loyalties and taboos civil, social, racial and ecclesiastical, the Groups have shewn the way to a similar freedom by a poverty not in material but in psychological things. No mesh of those kinds can hold men who are so small that they are only sinners. This spiritual poverty by penitence seems to me to be the really striking, original and valuable contribution of Buchmanism to religion and its message to a world cramped in a system of ideas which are too small for the new possibilities of life. Religious poverty has a reward in gaiety of life. Groupists also are "God's Jesters." One may add, don't expect all jokes to be good, and the sense of humour (humor) varies in different individuals and countries.

Some short mention should be made also of other groups doing evangelistic work. At Oxford, for instance, there is a group of evangelicals centred upon St. Peter's Hall and the Oxford Pastorate, whose numbers are certainly comparable to those of the so-called Oxford Group Movement. This movement is strongly opposed to the particular methods of Buchmanism, and many of its members have gone out of Buchmanism to find salvation in a renewed zeal on more orthodox evangelical lines. The Anglican-Evangelical Group carries the same spirit into parishes. It is ascetic and social, and shews willingness to co-operate, though doubtless reservedly, with Catholic and Modernist.

There is the Youth Movement, about which we need only notice the fact of its youthfulness. There is the Way of Renewal, whose object is that of preparation of materials for an adequate and up-to-date evangelism.

The corresponding movements on the Continent have been mentioned.

Is there a moral to this tale ?

IN ORGANIZATION.—Firstly we note the sudden uprising of all these different societies. Surely this can only be regarded as evidence of a new interest in spiritual life. It challenges to be up and doing.

Secondly, the same conclusion is indicated by the prominence of the youthful and the lay elements.

Thirdly, we notice the outside-Church character. There is a rhythm of evangelism. A group forms outside. Thence it essays to come back to be the new life of the whole, or, if it fails in this, it organizes itself outside either to become the whole or to remain a sect. Thus St. John the Baptist started an outside movement in camps. Our Lord tried to bring it back into Temple and Synagogue. It was forced outside, and by the time of Constantine the outside had swallowed the inside. The monks and friars were outside, returned and became the life of the inside. More recent movements, such as Wesleyanism, have failed to return and are organized as sects. What will happen to these various groups and why ? The answer depends on the clergy and the faithful of our parishes. Already one notices some quickening of interest and a new aggressiveness in evangelistic efforts.

Fourthly, as a minor point but useful as a guide to behaviour, there is the quality that I have described as "dry."

IN SPIRITUAL VALUES.—These various groups are very diverse. The tendency is to concentrate on some particular side; and there is a lack of wholeness in them. Thus in methods of evangelism Toc H and Buchmanism are opposites. So, again, are the starting-points of the messages of the A.C.C. or the Way

of Renewal as compared with those of Toc H or Buchmanism. There seems, therefore, a very real need for what I have called the inside to cultivate the values of each. Otherwise we shall lose our chances, and in this day of unity of life find new energies dissipated by sectarianism.

Taken together these values fall under the familiar headings of repentance, faith, and good works.

As regards repentance, modern man is profoundly worried about his sins and failures; so much so that old prejudices against confession are rapidly dissolving. Modern psychology has helped to this end, and during the last ten years has greatly altered the sort of things people say in their confessions. But the movement to penitence is not scientific but religious. Faith is found in two forms. On the one hand we have great doctrinal teaching. Let us go back to the study of the revelation of God through Jesus Christ and learn to preach it to the modern mind. How magnificently Archbishop Temple makes pure doctrine a means of evangelism! Read his mission addresses to Oxford University in *Christian Faith and Life*. On the other hand, there is faith as from intuition, an expectation of supernatural miracles.

As regards good works there is a new quality of ascetic and mystical living shewn especially in purification and fellowship and service. Men are also living more in prayer, worship and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. One has also noticed three old friends—poverty, obedience, and in a less degree, chastity—all three dressed, doubtless, in a new cut of clothes. Of these spiritual poverty is especially prominent. In the movement for fellowship religion is taking part in a wider current. In ecclesiastical affairs it hopes to advance reunion by purification of motives and by a humble and frank recognition of spiritual values. Surely we must labour to reframe the principles of a Christian sociology. Surely we must restudy standard works of ascetic and mystical theology. For the one Harton's *The Elements of the Spiritual Life*, for the other St. John of the Cross's analysis of purification and guidance in *The Ascent of Mount Carmel*. It can be brought up to date very easily by the study of any manual of modern psychology. But study only is a lifeless thing. If these groups are to fulfil the purpose of God and give new life to the whole, we must reorganize our lives ruthlessly along the above lines.

Finally and chiefly we note the emphasis on pure religious values as the main foundation from which may emerge the "good life." Science and organization are tools. But these last products of humanism are no sure means of salvation. We have learnt to fear them. No longer do we believe that "man is the master of things," but the Spirit of God by faith, hope and love.

RICHARD L. BARNES, C.R.

THE INTERPRETER SPIRIT

PART II

THE Spirit's function of interpretation is fulfilled at different times and by different operations. In the first days of the Church interpretation was of a special and temporary kind. There was as yet no written word of revelation, although there had been a spoken word of revelation. Jesus had spoken, Jesus had *revealed* to the twelve disciples. How was the revelation to be preserved and made available until the end of the world? By the aid of the Spirit, through the operation of the Spirit's function. "But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you" (John xiv. 26). This is the Spirit's function of primary inspiration—primary in the time sequence. The disciples needed preparation and equipment to make permanent the teaching of Jesus, to record it, to write it, and so to preserve it. "He shall teach" is explained by the following words—"bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you."

Moreover, just as the evangelists and apostles were inspired by the Spirit to *write* the New Testament, the Spirit also guided, taught, prepared, inspired the prophets of the Jewish dispensation to write the Old Testament. But the function of inspiration must be kept distinct from the function of revelation. The revealer is the Son, the inspirer is the Spirit. The Spirit inspired the biblical writers to put on record the word revealed to them by the Son. This contrast is perhaps more clearly evident in the Old Testament. The prophetic writings are preceded by "Thus saith the Lord." They are recording a word, a spoken word. The Old Testament more plainly makes clear the Spirit's function of equipping men for action, for hearing and proclaiming the "Thus saith the Lord." So revelation is the function of the Son as Word of God in both Old and New Testament eras, making known the purpose of the Father from the divine side, "from that side," as Barth would say. Inspiration is the function of the Spirit, in both Old and New Testament eras, preparing, equipping the minds of prophets, evangelists, apostles, on the human side, "on this side," to hear and proclaim and write what is revealed.

So far as inspiration operates through men, it is subject to the limitations of its instruments. The Spirit does not displace the normal activity of human faculties, it quickens them without

changing them, it supplements them without inhibiting them. Although human error creeps in from time to time, not indeed as the result of wilful refusal to record what is preserved or heard, but as the result of human weakness, limitation, and inability to grasp and mediate all that is offered. Verbal inspiration can only be allowed in the sense that the biblical writers were inspired to write down as much as they could grasp of the revelation of the Word of God in Old and New Testaments.

Thus "verbal inspiration" does not originate the divine content of Scripture. The content of Scripture is not inspired, it is revealed. The biblical writers were inspired to write down the revealed word. The Spirit's function of inspiration operates not on the Bible message, on the revelation of the Word of God as such, but on the human writers and the written word, and in so far as the written word is the work of men, whose imperfections are not removed by inspiration, we can never appeal finally to the mere letter of Scripture, and the functions of criticism and history will always be required to assist with the understanding of the revelation behind the inspired words.

The Spirit is the Interpreter. Inspiration is a function of interpretation; in order to interpret the revelation or Word of God to succeeding ages, the prophets, evangelists and apostles were inspired to write. This was the primary inspiration—the equipment of the writer. But there is a secondary inspiration—the equipment of the reader. If prophets and evangelists required equipment to understand what they wrote, we also require equipment to understand what we read. This is the most important function of the Holy Spirit for us today.

"There was need of the Spirit's aid to take of the things which were His own, which had already been revealed, and make them known to the consciousness of the Church, or conversely, to inspire the Church to apprehend what had already been revealed through the channel of inspired prophets and writers. An illumination of the Spirit is as necessary for him who hears and reads, as for him who prophesies or writes, an illumination of the 'Spirit of Truth whom the world cannot receive, for it beholdeth Him not, neither heareth Him; ye know Him; for He abideth with you and shall be in you' (John xiv. 17). The difference between a man of the world and a man of the Church is that the latter, being filled with the Spirit, is able to understand the things of the Spirit, and especially to perceive the due import of truth revealed by the Spirit in generations gone by" (*The Holy Spirit*, p. 44).

Karl Barth does not assign the specific term "interpreter" to the Spirit, nor does he define His special activity as that of interpretation, but he does emphasize this *function* of the Spirit's operation. "The fact is that a man cannot believe what is simply held *before* him. He can believe nothing that is not

both *within* him and before him. He can *not* believe what does not reveal itself to him, that has not the power to penetrate to him. . . . Only the God who reveals Himself is God" (*Word of God and Man*, p. 202). His meaning becomes clear in another passage in the same work: "spirit is recognized only by spirit, God only by God" (*ibid.*, p. 243). In the *Dogmatik* (I. 455) he says: "This accessibility (to God) happens when His Word through the Spirit speaks to the spirit . . . the same Spirit in us hears," and again elsewhere: "This Spirit through whom the Logos-Revelation in the spoken and written word of testimony goes forth into all the world, is as such the principle of all representation and revelation, the unfailing and invariable Lord and Judge of all which the Church 'speaks'" (*Die Theologie und die Kirche*, p. 315).

In other words, it is the Spirit who interprets the Word of Revelation to man, and the Spirit only. At this point Barth balances his transcendental view of God by introducing the conception of immanence. "Indeed only 'in the Spirit' (*ἐν πνεύματι*) in actual communion with God can man pray to God" (*Dogmatik*, I. 208). If it is a principle of the Barthian theology that man stands over against God, who is so incomprehensible and unapproachable that man by himself can never find Him, yet by the aid of the indwelling Spirit of God man is brought close to God, and made to know God. The Spirit is the principle of immanence. This idea is amplified in *Zur Lehre vom Heiligengeist*.

Many writers are agreed that the most satisfactory source of Trinitarian doctrine, and therefore of the doctrine of the Spirit, in Holy Scripture is to be found in the Johannine gospel.* That is to say, the original source of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Spirit is to be found in the word of Revelation. This is Karl Barth's teaching, and that writer extends its range by including the creeds and orthodox tradition under the Spirit's own influence within the sphere of revelation (*Dogmatik*, I. 362 ff.), but Barth would not agree with Dr. Kirk's final conclusion that Christian experience provides the final basis for the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. His theology, like that of Brunner, is a protest against the efficacy of human experience and knowledge as a means of making God known, for that is the function of revelation. Human experience has a part to play, but entirely subordinate, and only in so far as it is not merely guided but occupied by the Holy Spirit.

Commenting on Romans v. 5, "because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given

* Cf. Green, *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, p. 298; Raven, *Apolinarism*, p. 35; and less confidently Kirk, *Essays*, p. 208.

unto us," Barth says: "The Holy Ghost is the work of God in faith, the creating and saving-power of the kingdom of heaven, which coming down here, touches man and his world into faith, as a glass is made to ring. He is the eternal Yes! which forms the content of that which, seen temporarily, is only to be described as negation, as a vacuum of faith. He is the miraculous, the original, the creative in faith, equal in rank with God (*Ebenbürtige*), and on His account God counts righteousness to the believer." Barth continues by emphasizing the distinctiveness of the invisible Spirit, which has no connection with the psychological, visible, human spirit. The Spirit is set up as the human subject, as a newly constituted subject, which stands and endures as the "I" of man before God, so that it becomes something which is divine, that unity which religious experience always aims at and seeks after, but never finds, so that we have peace with God and entrance to this grace. The Holy Spirit is therefore "given," given by God, and he makes a quotation from Hofmann: "The Holy Spirit, the effective ground of holy life, was not by nature in us, but now the love of God is in our hearts through Him" (*Römerbrief*, p. 134 f., cf. p. 441). Barth appears to identify the presence of the Holy Spirit so closely with the believer that the *ego* becomes *nos*. "We have peace with God," means "I" and the Spirit in me; "there comes about an 'I' and a 'we,' a heart of man which God can love" (*ibid.*, p. 135).

The instrument of this union with, or indwelling of, the Holy Spirit in the individual is faith; but faith itself, like its content, is the gift of God. "The new man lives through faith, for he lives by the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost is given to him through faith" (*ibid.*, p. 136). This sentence is expanded in the *Dogmatik*, I., where faith is considered under different aspects, which are all comprehended within a remark that faith is "the gift of the Holy Spirit," and is the result of God's approach and address to man.

In Barth's teaching, grace is also a gift of the Spirit, derived rather from the original New Testament significance of the word as the favour of God (*Römerbrief*, pp. 203 f., 209 f.), than from the Augustinian notion of a state of sanctification or salvation, though, of course, the latter is not wanting in Barth's thought. But Barth here definitely dissociates the gift of grace from the second person of the Trinity, and associates it with the Holy Spirit. This must be so if faith is the product of the indwelling Spirit of God in man. God's favour, and its effects, must spring from the same Spirit. The "eternal source of grace is the Holy Spirit" (*Dogmatik*, I. 211). In this sense the Creed rightly defines Him as Holy, Lord, and Giver of Life.

He offers to men life-giving grace, and with this conception Barth reveals his idea of the divine immanence which balances the extreme transcendentalism of much of his teaching. He quotes Calvin, who describes the Spirit as the sustainer of everything, being everywhere spread abroad, who animates and gives life to being in heaven and in earth, by pouring out His vigorous essence into all, inspiring life and motion in them. The Holy Spirit is that which the whole material and spiritual creation is not, and without Him has not. He is the Love, the bond of peace, the communion between Father and Son (quoting Augustine). This hypostatizing of the love of the Father for the Son is identical, according to Thomas Aquinas, with a divine love for us and all creation. Hence is derived the special character of the Holy Spirit as God turning Himself to us and appropriating us. So He is the fundamental gift, not merely because He is given by a special act, but because it was His character to be given from all eternity. So He is a gift, the gift of all gifts, God as the donation of God, the eternal source of Grace, the Holy Spirit (*ibid.*, p. 209 ff.). Thus the eternal life which is the gift of God, upon which Barth discourses at length in the commentary on the Romans, is the gift of the Spirit, the Life-Giver Himself. Grace proves to be more than favour, or the implication of life: more than sanctification or the preparation for life: it is life itself, in the form of an infusion of the Holy Spirit, in the form of an inpouring of the Lord of Life Himself.

In his pamphlet on the Holy Spirit, *Zur Lehre vom Heiligengeist*, Barth has not entirely cleared away his earlier confusion between the Word and the Spirit, but he gathers together and clarifies his earlier pronouncements on the relation of the Holy Spirit to man, and on that relationship his teaching is clear. It is only when discussing the relation of the Spirit to the Word—*i.e.*, the Trinitarian problem—that he is still somewhat uncertain. If the life of God is not identical with the life of the soul, yet there is a continuity between the un-created Spirit and the created spirit. God, who is not the soul, is originally in the soul, forgotten and only to be recollected by grace. The knowledge of this continuity between God and the soul is the gift of the Spirit, by revelation. This is the second miracle of God's love—the first being the creation of the soul. The Holy Spirit enables us to know the Word of the Creator. It follows, therefore, that all hearing of the creative word of God, which makes human life a Christian life, is not human work, but the work of the Holy Spirit. We cannot even hear the Word unless the Spirit hears in us. In the Holy Spirit man believes and hears on the farther side of all ethical sense,

which is a mere servant to the Word of God. Sin is unbelief, opposition to the revelation of the living God. Grace which reconciles from sin is the Spirit of God the Reconciler, not the spirit of truth, goodness and beauty. So one function of the Holy Spirit must be punitive. Only in the Spirit does man see and believe that he is a sinner. In the contest with unbelief, faith triumphs, yet not human faith, but the Holy Spirit triumphing in a man. From the Holy Spirit comes experience, joy, certainty. In the Holy Spirit we have a conscience, we *know with* God, the difference between good and evil.

The Holy Spirit is especially the Spirit of Sanctification, which is to be clearly distinguished from Justification, a distinction recently made by Bishop Headlam and others in the volume entitled *The Doctrine of Grace*. The Holy Ghost is the judge of what is, and of what is not, the Christian life; and by his grace alone we are able to serve God and our neighbour. The Holy Spirit is present in us eschatologically. This is one of the most powerful sections in Barth's little work. The Holy Ghost is literally to us the Spirit of promise. The blessed finality indicated to us in Revelation is future, and is in a state of becoming. We are assured of it, because He is present with us, and through the Spirit of promise we are sealed to the day of Salvation. Our future, like grace itself, is not already given (*datum*), but is in process of being given (*dandans*). Here we observe a change in Barth's thought when this statement is compared with his earlier pronouncements. We are children of God because of this future, not because we are created by God, or because His grace is already mighty in us. That is to say, our childhood is heirship. We are heirs of the promise, not those who already completely possess. This final gift of the Spirit is always coming, it is never already come. Even true prayer is possible only in the Spirit. The wonder of prayer is the intercession of the Spirit, with and for the one who prays—the idea of a communion of the Holy Spirit with our spirit which we have already noticed in the *Römerbrief*.

In his earlier writing Barth discussed the relation of grace and the Holy Spirit to Baptism, basing his argument on the proposition that "the revelation of God to man is possible for man only so far as he becomes, through the Holy Ghost in Baptism, what he by himself cannot become, a hearer and doer of the Word of God" (*Dogmatik*, I. 284). The subjective possibility of this revelation is grace, or the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (p. 285), a phrase which is several times repeated. This is the miracle: the Holy Spirit creates faith and obedience in men. Just as He permitted the world to become out of nothing, and the dwelling of the Logos in the womb of

the Virgin, so He creates out of a broken fragment lost human nature, human knowledge and human action, which have for their object the Spirit Himself in His revelation (p. 290). The Holy Spirit is the actuality in which we meet the revelation of God. He makes the Word light to our blind eyes. Where there is no Word of God there is no Spirit of God. When the Word is spoken to us and received by us, then has the Spirit worked (p. 297). But Baptism does not supply me with this grace, only God the Word and Spirit can do that. Baptism is not the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. So I cannot ground my trust on my baptism, as if by being baptized I am endowed with grace. Only through God do I come to God, only through grace have I trust in grace, and in Baptism a man is placed under the sign of grace. This sign is not grace, nor does it bring or give it. The Word only is grace, and only the Spirit brings and gives it. Baptism is not grace, but it signifies the actuality of grace. It signifies to us that we exist in grace through the Holy Spirit, and are become hearers and doers of the Word. It is a signifying grace, a symbol (p. 299 f.).

But Barth's symbolism is not bare. An empty symbolism would negative the whole of his preceding argument concerning the Spirit's function in the impartation of grace. Indeed, in the midst of his argument he says that the Holy Spirit is in Baptism, and has actual presence, and is furnished through Baptism under the sign of grace (p. 299). There is a virtue of the sacrament which is a virtue of grace itself. What Baptism does is to supply us with a criterion of grace. It is a sacramental self-knowledge (p. 301 f.). He is anxious to guard against any notion that mere human action, even in Baptism, can secure for us the grace of the Spirit. The dynamic in Baptism is the Holy Spirit. The actual Baptism itself is the symbol of the dynamic influence of the Spirit, or, as he expresses it in the commentary on the Romans, it is the visible temporal beginning of our knowledge of God, the formative "sign" (p. 171).

With reference to the other sacrament he says: "And in the Lord's Supper . . . is not the Spirit which adds substance to the symbol and revelation to the witness of revelation, poured out according to His own free pleasure—and yet not poured out?" (*Word of God and Man*, p. 258). In this passage he again balances his transcendental view of God by introducing the Spirit as the principle of divine immanence, but he plainly supplies a content to the Eucharistic symbol—"the Spirit which adds substance to the symbol." But no doubt, as in Baptism, he would say that the Spirit, or the mediated presence of Christ, is not actually in the elements, and in this sense the Spirit is

not poured out. He would also doubtless say that the *communion*, and still more the consecrated elements, are the sign and the criterion of a spiritual feeding mediated by the Spirit.

We shall look forward to hearing more from Barth on this matter, but we may observe that for the present, in this connection, he is quite consistent with his description of the Spirit as the life-giver, the life-imparting.

Such a conception is also consistent with the definition of the Spirit given at the beginning of this article. The mediating activity of the Holy Spirit is a function of interpretation. The Spirit is by nature and purpose the interpreter of the Word, who is the revealer. So far as the Word of God, the Son of God, is mediated to us in Holy Communion, this mediation is an interpretation. It brings us face to face with the Word, Christ, and the Spirit effects this Communion.

With this conception the other function of the Spirit as life-giver is closely related, even if it be not almost identical. On the Barthian principle to receive grace for the gift of life is to become face to face with the Word of God, the Logos, the Son; it is to comprehend the Word. But this is mediated by interpretation, by a comprehension of the Word revealed in the Bible, in Baptism, in Holy Communion, and the interpretation of the Word is a function of the Spirit. So He is the life-giver because He is the interpreter, and we feed on the Bread of Life when we read and understand Scripture, under an illumination of mind and soul supplied by the indwelling Spirit who interprets for us, and so mediates or gives life.

The function of interpretation operates over an even wider area:

"The Old Testament teaches that the Spirit of God is the source from which is perfected the physical power of the man possessing bodily strength; he is the source from which is perfected the fulness of mental activity of him who is able to perceive new ideas, who is able to read the meaning of nature, and to invent machines for harnessing the forces of nature to man's service; the source from which is perfected the artistic skill of him who sees visions which others do not see, and is able to transfer them to canvas or stone, to wood or iron or all precious metals, or to the scroll of music. Yet we do not realize this source of energy, and we allow our gifts to operate, foreshortened of their full range, deprived of their full power, for lack of inspiration which He who was sent by Jesus to take charge of us and all our doings is waiting to breathe into us" (*The Holy Spirit*, p. 133 f.).

In a word, the function of the Spirit, whether in relation to physical activity or mental creation, is the function of interpretation, revealing to man what is already present and waiting to be grasped and made use of—revealing to man the physical

possibilities of his own constitution, and the undiscovered treasures of artistic genius, the undiscovered laws of Nature—doctrine which is indeed characteristic of Orthodox Greek theology. Someone has said that invention is discovery. We may add that the author of discovery, the agent of understanding, for the human intellect is the Interpreter-Spirit:

"The laws of nature and the forces of nature were there from the beginning of creation. But human understanding did not grasp and make use of the significance of their presence, a significance which was only won by scientific investigation and harnessed by inventive genius. Something of the same sort was stated at the British Association of 1930. All this was not achieved until the spirit of man gave itself to the study of God in nature. And although many of our leaders in this enterprise were blind to the true conditions of their work, yet even so the Spirit of God responded, and knowledge was given to man together with a power to harness nature's forces and make them serve the race. . . . Although they may refuse to acknowledge the source of their achievement, yet the methods of our men of science have often been more truly those of the Kingdom of God than the methods of many of the sons of the Kingdom, for they have made truth and honesty and sincerity, and untiring industry, the method of their work. . . . And they have their reward, a reward in which we and all mankind share" (*ibid.*, p. 135 f.).

For the Spirit of Wisdom and Knowledge, the Spirit of God, has revealed and interpreted to them the hidden laws of Nature, and by that revelation and interpretation modern material progress has been established.

A. J. MACDONALD.

TOWARDS REUNION AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CLERGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

THIS is neither an ecclesiastical nor a doctrinal approach to the question of Reunion; it is a purely personal one, not only in the sense that it is an individual expression of views to which no one but the writer is committed, but in the sense that it deals with an important personal consideration that arises when the union or reunion of Christian Churches is thought of.

Such an approach to the subject I would justify on the ground that the personal factor from first to last enters into the matter of Reunion, and, however much we may tend to lose sight of the fact, must in the ultimate issue exercise the determining influence. For essentially Reunion, if it is to mean anything more than an ecclesiastical arrangement, a *mariage de convenance*, means a new spiritual relationship between followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, a relationship involving un-

restricted fellowship in the use of the means of grace and in the service of the Kingdom of God. When questions of faith and order have been settled by the competent authorities, union can only be effective as it is expressed in the mutual relations of human personalities.

Even before that stage is reached, and as the pre-condition of its happy development, the personal factor plays its part. As in all negotiations and efforts towards a common mind, so in an especially high degree in conversations having as their objective the promotion of Christian unity, success or failure depends as much as anything on the way in which the negotiators regard each other, the degree of mutual trust and esteem exhibited, and the extent to which in the very act of negotiation a spirit of Christian brotherliness is engendered.

This indeed is acknowledged, for the parties themselves declare that a large part of the value of their conversations lies in the opportunity afforded to "get to know each other," and in getting to know each other to learn something of the inner spirit of each other's ecclesiastical traditions.

This, however, I venture to suggest, is not enough. It is excellent that Anglican bishops and Free Church ministers, who have hitherto moved in different orbits if not on widely different planes, should discover by association with one another what a very great deal they have in common as fellow-servants of Jesus Christ. But, just because Reunion, when it comes, will be an affair of the rank and file of Christian people gathered in their congregations, preparation for its coming must be made not only in episcopal palaces where the elect gather for conference, but in town and country parishes throughout the land.

In such preparation leadership and initiative must inevitably come from the accredited officials of the various Churches, and the extent to which these exercise the needed leadership will just as inevitably depend on their personal relations with one another. Where there is cordiality and a full recognition of the other man as a fellow-worker in the cause of Christ, there the prospects are favourable for *rapprochements* between the congregations concerned. Where, on the other hand, relations so far from being cordial are not even friendly, the breach in the Christian fellowship of the congregations stands no chance of being healed.

I write with the experience of twenty-three years as a Free Church minister in England behind me, and it is to me a matter of greater surprise than I can express that this factor in the question of Reunion, which to my mind is of overwhelming importance, has received no mention in anything I have read on this vital subject. Does this silence mean that our negotiators in high places assume that in order to bring the Anglican

clergy and the Free Church ministers into the cordial relations that their work of leadership in the matter of Reunion will demand, all that is required is to come to an agreement on the validity—in some sense—of Free Church orders? Or does it mean that they do not realize the importance of this factor, and hence are not troubled by the great gulf that in hundreds of parishes yawns between the vicar and his curates on the one hand and the Free Church ministers on the other?

I do not say that this gulf exists in every parish. I know Free Church ministers who have been and are on the friendliest possible terms with their Anglican confrères, not only personally and socially, but in matters that pertain to their respective offices. The divergent ecclesiastical traditions present no barrier to spiritual fellowship in work and worship, even to the extent of preaching in each other's pulpits. But those Free Church ministers who enjoy these close relations would be the first to admit that their case is not typical, that in any ordinary community, while the Free Church ministers enjoy among themselves a natural *camaraderie*, the Anglican clergy tend to hold aloof.

Now in dealing with this aloofness, to give it no other name, I am conscious that I am approaching ground on which it is needful to tread warily. The need arises from the fact that it is extraordinarily difficult, even for one who seeks to probe his own mind, to separate and disentangle the two quite different reactions which the Free Church minister naturally makes to what I may call the thus-far-and-no-farther attitude so often adopted by his Anglican brother. The one reaction is personal, and the other may best be described as ministerial. The Free Churchman is a man, but he is also a minister. In the former capacity he may—and I will not deny that he sometimes does—feel acute resentment at what looks to him, and sometimes is, patronizing treatment. Absorbing the impression, whether justly or as the result of supersensitiveness, that as a Free Church minister he is regarded as of an inferior order as well as in doubtful orders, he may say in his heart bitter words about snobbishness and superiority, although in so doing he may be not far from being guilty of the same defects of character himself.

This first reaction—the personal one—is quite natural, and being so is at best sub-Christian, and may on occasion become actually un-Christian. For that reason it is part of a man's moral discipline to control it, and I think on the whole Free Church ministers control it pretty well.

But the other reaction—the ministerial—is of a different order altogether. The Free Churchman is not only a man, but he is a minister of a Church which he believes is a true Church, and

of which he believes that, under God, he is a true minister. The "ministerial" reaction is against anything that suggests or implies that the non-episcopal, non-established Church he serves occupies a lower place not only in this realm of ours, but actually in the sight of God.

I have admitted that as the heart is above all things deceitful and desperately wicked it is a matter of extreme difficulty to disentangle in thought the two causes for resentment at what falls, or seems to fall, below full Christian brotherliness. But I would have any of my Anglican brethren who may read this to know that the average Free Church minister, however much or little he may care about his *amour propre*, cares a very great deal about his *amour ecclésiastique*; and that there is a great opportunity here for them to do something in preparation for Reunion by, if I may be so frank, avoiding not only what I hope I may be forgiven for calling an ecclesiastical Balliol manner, but also those hurtful pin-pricks which have the power of inflicting pain on the Free Church brother in the region where his feelings are most justifiably sensitive, the region of his love and loyalty to his Church.

If I may be held to have escaped so far the charge of peevishness or worse, may I specify a little further what I mean? I will not cite cases, though such abound, where, by the fact of being a minister of the Church as by law established, the vicar of the parish is accorded on given occasions, if not a spiritual monopoly, at least a visible pre-eminence, and is content to have it so. The Establishment has, I believe, quite as disturbing an influence psychologically on the intercourse between Anglican clergy and Free Church ministers as the question of validity of orders has, but I will confine myself to matters into which the Establishment does not enter. My illustrations will be drawn from happenings within my own knowledge, though not exclusively within my personal experience.

For example, we may take the subject of pulpit interchanges. I do not suggest here that any Anglican clergyman should ask me or any other Free Churchman to occupy his pulpit. But suppose a Free Church minister in the parish of A forms a friendship with the vicar of B, and having been invited to preach in the parish Church of B desires to return the compliment. The vicar of A has the power to object to the vicar of B entering his parish and preaching in an unconsecrated building, but need he exercise that power? Might he not stretch the ecclesiastical point in the interests of something higher? Or if a Lay Reader is asked to take a service in a Free Church, in case of the minister's illness, say, or in other sudden emergency, need his vicar necessarily interpose his veto? And if on some national or other special occasion the vicar of the parish wishes to associate

a Free Church minister with him in a united service, has not the time come when some other part than the reading of the lesson should be apportioned to the visitor? Every Free Church minister knows that the reading of the lesson in an Anglican church can be performed by laymen, and may he not be excused if he sees in what purports to be a gesture of friendliness a covert slight upon his orders? Or consider the vexed question of burials in country churchyards. How many simple folk are under the impression that only the parish clergy are entitled to conduct the service, and in how many cases do lifelong members of village chapels ignorantly "go past" their own minister when death has occurred in their home? Might not the vicar, when applied to in such cases, point out to the bereaved that the Free Church minister has a perfect right to conduct the service in the churchyard, and, more than that, give him every facility for doing so?

Just one other point, but one over which many heartburnings have been caused. If children of Anglican parents attach themselves, as in industrial districts thousands of them do, to a Free Church Sunday School, is it necessary for the vicar of the parish, on hearing of their misdemeanour, to demand that they uproot themselves from an environment in which they are happy and are being spiritually cared for, and submit to being transplanted into one of which they have had no previous experience and in which maybe they have no friends? Is such an exercise of ecclesiastical authority justified in view of the danger, and more than danger, that these children will fall between the two agencies that are competing for their souls, and be lost to all spiritual influence altogether? Or, to take something even worse, is it conducive to creating an atmosphere favourable to Reunion for the vicar of the parish, with a Confirmation Class in view, to raid the Bible Classes of neighbouring Free Churches for the boys and girls who, he has reason to think, are "churchmen" by their baptism, even though all their personal spiritual history is bound up with the Free Church whose Sunday School they have attended?

These are a few illustrations of what I referred to as pin-pricks, the cessation of which would in itself do much to induce happier relations and give more chance for the schemes of the high contracting parties at Lambeth and elsewhere to fructify. That in itself would be a gain, but it seems to me that something of a more positive nature is still called for, and on this I would like to say what is in my mind.

I have already referred to the Free Church minister in his relations with his Anglican brother under the two aspects of the plain man and the Church official. There is a third aspect under

which both parties to the relationship may be regarded—namely, that of disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ to whom a very special work has been entrusted. My belief is that if this, which I have put last, could be put first by both of them it would be of incalculable benefit to the cause of Reunion. Looking at this matter from the Free Church point of view, I think I can say of most of my ministerial brethren that what we feel keenest in our faulty relationship with the Anglican clergy alongside of whom we work is the sense of mutual exclusion from the things we most care about. Even when the personal relations are friendly and cordial, the friendship and cordiality have a way of stopping short at the very point where they might be of more than superficial value—the point, I mean, of real spiritual fellowship and co-operation. The Free Churchman, though primarily he ministers to a congregation of people of his own persuasion, desires to serve the wider community just as much as the parish priest in his allotted territorial sphere; and the more he has of the true home-missionary spirit in him the more he realizes how much stronger the spiritual witness in the locality would be if some liaison could be effected between his own work, as he envisages it, and the, in essentials, identical work his Anglican brother is doing.

How close even in the present circumstances such a liaison can be I have already indicated in my reference to Anglican vicars and Free Church ministers who on occasion occupy each other's pulpits. The liberty of action which some incumbents permit themselves in this regard suggests that the rules of the Church of England are susceptible of some elasticity of interpretation, and that, given the will to put the stretching process into operation, our own and our congregations' hearts might now and then be gladdened by visible demonstrations of confraternity of a nature that would carry the conviction of reality with them. On this whole question of spiritual co-operation it seems to me to be putting the cart before the horse to expect some official declaration on orders to work a reconciling miracle. On the contrary, only, as I believe, through the discovery of a common spiritual task and the cultivation of fellowship in doing it will the question of orders find its truly Christian and therefore wholly satisfactory solution.

But short of fellowship as Christ's ministers, cannot there be fellowship as Christ's disciples? In the long run, does anyone suppose that the problem of reuniting the sundered branches of Christ's Church will be solved in the posture of conference round a table, and not rather in the posture of united intercession? Who, then, ought to be the first to get themselves to their knees but the accredited ambassadors of Christ, who, as representatives

of their order, have so much to confess and ask forgiveness for ? I remember very vividly, though it is nearly twenty-five years ago, the most moving prayer-meeting at which I was ever present. It was the monthly united prayer-meeting of the clergy and ministers of the little town of Thetford, and it was held in the Congregational minister's house. Those present comprised, beside our host, another theological student and myself, a Methodist minister, and two local vicars; and apologies for absence were read from a High Church clergyman and the Salvation Army Captain. To hear those apologies read was in itself a means of grace.

Cannot we start there: make living contact with each other through our living contact with our living Lord ? Indeed, must we not start there, for how else can Reunion come save through the spirit of union, through the discovery that because our Master needs us both it follows that we need each other ?

G. K. MACBEAN

(*Minister of the Presbyterian Church
of England*).

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

SINCE Father Hebert's important articles on the Epiclesis in the October issue, we have received a number of papers on the subject. Some of them were of great merit, and we should gladly have printed them. But selection was necessary, and the long article by Dom Gregory Dix, of which we publish the first half this time, was the most learned and the most original. He will not convince everyone, but it is right that he should be heard and considered.

Father Barnes deals in a comprehensive and charitable way with a number of the spiritual forces that are apparent in the life of today. Most of us are aware of the existence of much that he describes, but he does good service in co-ordinating the movements and setting them in their place. We hope soon to publish an article on another quite recent movement, which Father Barnes does not specifically mention, the Seven Years Association.

The author of "Towards Reunion" is an "English Presbyterian." Our own experience has been more encouraging than his, but even the most well-meaning of us have a limited and perhaps prejudiced stand-point, and it is wholesome from time to time to look at the thing from another side.

Readers of THEOLOGY who are willing to pass on their copy to a missionary should write to Mrs. Vibert, S.P.G House, Westminster, S.W.1, and say so. Enclose a stamped card for reply.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,

Since writing my article on "Some Fishing Stories in the Gospels" (January, 1934) I have read the passage in Thompson's *The Land and the Book* which deals with fishing. He mentions a "bag" net as used at sea today in Palestine, and as distinct from the hand net and seine net, both of which are drawn to the shore. It would, I suppose, be somewhat similar to a modern trawl net, though probably without the beam. In some ways this would suit the conditions of the miraculous draught of fishes better than a herring net, or one of that type, since the herring net will only catch fish of one size, too large to pass through the mesh, but small enough to insert their heads in it and so get caught by the gills. The bag net would catch fish of any size and the mention of great fishes (John xxi. 11) implies that different sizes could be caught. In a bag net, however, as in a seine, the catch would be drawn together in a mass at the bottom of the bag, and such a weight of fish as is implied could not have been drawn into the boat in a mass as I have already mentioned in my article. An old fisherman I have consulted suggests

that the apostles may have unloaded the fish from the net into the boat by hand or with a basket or small landing net, and that whilst they were doing so, the net broke and many fish escaped. I think that this suggestion presents the fewest difficulties. Moreover a bag net would be more easily drawn to there as in John xxi. than a herring net. As a bag net is a deep-sea net the argument in my article is not weakened. Only a deep-sea net could have made such a catch.

Yours faithfully
M. BUCHANNAN.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Zeitschrift für die N.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1933. Heft 4.

CARL SCHMIDT discusses the Chester Beatty MS. of the gospels and Sir Frederick Kenyon's edition of it. He regrets that Sir Frederick should repeat the statement that the origin of the collection is unknown, ignoring his (Schmidt's) account of the place of origin (the village of Alame, near the ancient Aphroditopolis). The MS. was evidently a faulty copy which could not be used, and was put away in a pot since there were scruples about destroying a holy book. The epoch-making result of the discovery is that we can be certain that the text of the Gospels was fixed at a very early date. E. BICKERMANN's article on 2 Macc. i. 1-9 shews that it is a "festal letter" to the Jews of Alexandria, telling them when to keep the Feast of Dedication. The messenger would give the precise date, which varied with the ascertaining of the New Moon at Jerusalem; the occasional intercalary month had also to be made known to the Jews of the dispersion. *The Bishop of Alexandria continued the custom in his Festal Letters announcing the date of Easter.* A. BAKKER of Amsterdam, writing in English, suggests that Christ was styled "angel" in the *Testimonia*, and that the Epistle to the Hebrews has in view an "angelic" Christology. L. BRUN of Oslo gives very good grounds for believing that Luke xxii. 43, 44 (the Bloody Sweat and the Angel strengthening Jesus) is original and was omitted for dogmatic reasons. J. SVENNING of Uppsala proves that *statio* is of military origin and originally meant a "fast" in ecclesiastical Latin. The usage "station (days)" is secondary.

W. K. L. C.

Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses. October, 1933.

This number opens with an obituary notice of Canon Jacques Forget, who was until his death, which occurred on July 19 last, a member of the editorial board of the review. He was eighty-one years of age, and had had a long and distinguished career in Belgium as an Oriental scholar. After study in Syria he became Professor of Arabic at Louvain in 1885, and was in charge of the Arabic section of the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, published by that University. Testimony is also given to the many other activities of this devoted and scholarly priest.

There follows a Latin article containing the first part of a consideration of Divine Providence and Sin, setting out the differences between the teachings of Catholic writers and that of Calvin. Fr. F. Zigon, the author, finds some inconsistency in the doctrine of St. Thomas on this point, especially in regard to the Thomistic treatment of predestination. This

requires modification in order to be brought into line with the rest of his teaching. Here is, of course, a well-known difficulty. It has been said that, whereas in Kant we get a phenomenal necessity with a noumenal freedom, St. Thomas gives us a phenomenal freedom with a noumenal necessity.

Fr. Cacciatore, C.SS.R., returns to the subject, previously discussed in this review, of the morality of "counselling the lesser of two evils." After a long examination of various authors, he concludes that such counsel in the given circumstances is morally justifiable. He claims both St. Augustine and St. Thomas for this view.

There is an informative article by the late Fr. M. de Jonghe on "Baptism in the Name of Jesus in the Acts." This was the original baptismal formula. The introduction of the Trinitarian formula belongs to a later stage and represents a change made by the Church. To make such a change was entirely within the Church's competence.

There are one or two other articles, and the usual book reviews.

W. R. V. BRADE.

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xxv., No. 3.

Rabbi Herbert Parzen contributes a useful article, "Israel in Palestine: the Prophetic View," in which he expounds the covenant relationship between Jahwe and Israel. The land of their inheritance is Jahwe's land. Israel must live ethically and religiously in order to dwell in it. If the covenant is broken and the ethical standard not maintained, Israel forfeits its right to live in the country.

Dr. D. de Sola Pool writes on the sad but fascinating story of *The Marranos*—Jews who for centuries have secretly held the faith of their fathers with an outward profession of Christianity. Every possible attempt was made by these unfortunate people to escape the horrors of the Inquisition. Christian baptism was accepted, children were brought up as Christians to all outward appearances, and in a considerable number of cases—it seems almost incredible—Marranos were admitted to Holy Orders. Knowledge of Hebrew naturally died out, only the fewest fragments being preserved in oral tradition—e.g., *Adonai* has been in common use among them from the sixteenth century down to the present time. It had been commonly assumed that all traces of Judaism in the Peninsula had disappeared among the descendants of the Jews forced into Christianity four hundred years ago. It remained for the present century to discover the existence of tens of thousands of Marranos in the heart of Portugal.

Dr. Bernhard Heller continues his lengthy and valuable review of *The Legends of the Jews*—that monumental work of wonderful industry and scholarship from the pen of Professor Louis Ginzberg, who has recently been described as one of the greatest masters of the Talmud in modern times.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

NOTES

A NOTE ON SELF-EXAMINATION

THE problem of getting any reality into the Self-examination and Confession which we urge upon our younger Confirmation candidates is one that has worried me for some time; and, from conversation with other

parish priests, I find that I am by no means alone in my anxiety. We all recognize the importance of real penitence, but what parish priest is satisfied with the conventional methods of getting it? Various forms of "Self-examination" are published with their dreary catalogues of sins from "I have laughed at drunkards" to "I have joined in schismatic worship"; but anyone with even the modicum of popular psychology which is now the property of most clergy would agree that such forms are too morbidly introspective to have very much value.

This year I have tried what is to me an entirely new scheme, with results that have been so satisfactory that I should like to offer it as a suggestion to other priests. Each candidate came to me separately, and I talked to him about the necessity of trustworthiness in those who desired to be admitted to full membership of the "Body of Christ." But how are we to know what our Lord expects of us? So we took a Bible and I directed him to the "fruits of the Spirit" in Gal. v. We then took a sheet of quarto paper and ruled it into three vertical columns and nine horizontal sections. In each section of the left-hand column I wrote one of the nine "fruits of the Spirit"—*Love, Joy, Peace, etc.* I then asked the candidate to tell me what these words meant to him, and I wrote his answers in the second column, adding a few suggestions of my own. Thus opposite *Love* we might get "Trying to be friends with people; forgiving others; not bearing grudges against people; helping father and mother." So we worked slowly through the list. I then pointed out that we had written a catalogue of the sort of things that a Christian ought to be. Then in the third column we wrote the opposites of all that we had written in column 2. Thus against the examples just mentioned we might have got "Refusing to make friends; not forgiving, but bearing grudges; quarrelling; not helping at home," and so on down the list.*

I then told the candidate to take the paper home and meditate carefully upon the details of the Christian character in column 2, and try to get the ideal into his head. Then, in applying this to his own life and character, he would find that in certain places he had been straying over the line into the wrong column. Where this had happened his friendship with God was weakened, and the "way back" was through Confession. I then instructed him to mark with a pencil the places where that had happened. The next week each brought his paper back to me in church and (only with his willing permission) we went through it together and discussed certain details. The list having been shewn to me, I told him that he must now shew it to God, and gave him the perfectly free choice between private and Sacramental Confession, both having been carefully explained in the first interview. All but one chose the latter.

Such is the plan which I have tried, and it has certainly been far more satisfactory than anything I have tried before. The weakness of the scheme is that you are inclined to miss certain real sins if you cling too closely to the mere opposites of the virtues which you have already noted. This can be avoided if the priest knows in his own mind what he wants the list to contain over and above what the candidate suggests. The obvious advantages are: (1) It is based on the Bible, which is treated as the normal textbook of the Christian disciple. (2) It lays the emphasis on the positive virtue rather than on the sin, which is looked upon as an

* S.P.C.K. are about to publish a penny book on self-examination on "The Fruits of the Spirit."

aberration from the ideal, and therefore something unworthy, something to be ashamed of. This is a real help towards Penitence, especially among the young. (3) The plan is of the candidate's own making, and therefore is likely to be more real and personal to him than any printed form drawn up by someone else. (4) Each paper has a certain individuality, and can be treated as strictly confidential. This the boy or girl will probably be proud to do, and it will thus avoid those sniggering conferences under lamp-posts or in the light of shop-fronts to decide which of the sins ought to be marked! (5) The scheme can be worked in subsequent years on the basis of the Beatitudes, or 1 Cor. xiii. or the Ten Commandments.

J. R. H. MOORMAN.

A PUBLIC SCHOOL'S EXPERIMENT

FOR some years now we have been conscious that no adequate attempt was being made here to put before the older boys Christianity as a reasonable system of belief. One result of the growth of a custom of Confirmation at an earlier age in public schools has been that Confirmation preparation involves less dogmatic instruction than formerly. Sermons cannot fill the gap, as the difference in age, in intellectual and spiritual standards between various members of the school is too great, even if sermons could be longer. Further, for some reason the school seems to resent the to-be-continued type of sermon. Divinity lessons under ordinary school conditions, at least here, do not seem to provide the opportunity; experience here seems to suggest that while Sixth Form boys, for instance, will gladly join a study-circle to read and discuss Alington's *Doubts and Difficulties* or Temple's *Christian Faith and Life*, under classroom conditions the same boys tend to be affected by an intangible classroom atmosphere which prevents Divinity lessons from being so happy. The writer would be prepared to believe that it was only his failure as a teacher were it not that others have described a similar experience. No doubt some teachers have been most successful, but here at least Divinity lessons have not met this particular need.

That the public schools do fail to provide a grounding in the intellectual basis of the Christian faith is, I think, part of the explanation of the undoubted fact that a large proportion of boys at once drop the practice of their religion on leaving school. I should not seriously disagree with the statements of the facts as given by Mr. Arnold Lunn or the Bishop of Bradford in the recent book *Public School Religion*, although I think the issues are not quite so simple as Mr. Lunn suggests.

Here at Tonbridge we have planned a course of twenty-four lectures to be given to the topmost block in the school, approximately of ninety boys. Each lecture is to be given twice in order that the class may be divided into two more reasonably-sized groups. In order to avoid the classroom atmosphere they are to take place in the choir-practice room in the music school. The boys are supplied with a typed syllabus, and are to write essays afterwards and to have opportunities for discussion of their essays. The scheme is to be spread over three years, on the assumption that the boys who are intellectually the most able will then attend the complete course. The course as arranged so far is as follows:

I. The Necessity of Religion	} Winter Term, 1933.
II. Theism and Science	
III. Theism and Morals	

IV.	Religion and Psychology	Lent Term, 1934.
V.					
VI.					
VII.	The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ	Summer Term, 1934.
VIII.					
IX.	The Cross	
X.	The Resurrection	
XI.	"Perfect God and Perfect Man"—the Doctrine of the Incarnation	Winter Term, 1934.

Other lectures are to include:

The Bible.

Human Immortality.

Orthodoxy—"Why it matters what I believe."

The Holy Spirit and the Church (two lectures).

The Achievements of Christianity (three lectures):

- (a) In the world.
- (b) In the lives of the Saints.
- (c) In culture.

The Modern "Solvents of Belief" (three lectures).

The Missionary Work of the Church (two or three lectures).

We are inviting outside lecturers, normally different for each term; to this principle there is one exception—the six lectures on the Life of our Lord and its meaning are to be given by the same speaker; the course as outlined, if divided between two speakers, might easily give the impression Jesus or Christ, God or Man, and so minister to the prevailing scepticism. The speakers have been asked to keep apologetics clearly in mind, yet without giving an impression that Christianity in the modern world is hopelessly on the defensive. The difficulty of their task arises from the fact that the boys in general are much franker in discussion than many people realize, and they have a considerable knowledge of the catch-phrases prevailing in, say, universities. For example, I have been told recently by a boy that all religion is simply an expression of sex-instinct and (by another boy) that repression (by which he meant self-control) is most dangerous. On the other hand, this width of so-called knowledge is coupled with very great ignorance. Very many quite able boys, for instance, think that science has disproved religion, but very few, even of the most able, have read Jeans' *Mysterious Universe*, still less Eddington's *Nature of the Physical World*. Hence the proportion of the course allotted to the foundations.

In the more distinctively Christian teaching the lecturers have been asked to provide an introduction to Christian theology, but in such a way as to lead up to the technical terms rather than to start from them. The average boy is almost invariably ignorant of the meaning of such words as Incarnation, Atonement, Revelation, Grace, and so on. Here possibly they resemble a larger proportion of their elders than most preachers realize!

Against one real danger the lecturers must guard. Most people nowadays are more ready to talk about religion than to practise it. The boys must not receive the impression that talking about religion is the real thing—all the time it must be clear that the lecture-room leads to the chapel.

S. H. C.

REVIEW

CANTERBURY ADMINISTRATION: THE ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY OF THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF CANTERBURY ILLUSTRATED FROM ORIGINAL RECORDS. By Irene Josephine Churchill, D.Phil., F.R.Hist.S., Assistant Lambeth Librarian. Published for the Church Historical Society. S.P.C.K. 2 vols. 42s.

These volumes are a welcome and distinguished addition to the growing series of monographs for which students of ecclesiastical history have reason to be grateful to the revived activities of the Church Historical Society. In spite of the zeal with which the history of administrative methods and organization has been pursued of recent years, diocesan administration has hitherto received little attention in England. Materials for its study are abundant, but they are widely scattered in episcopal and archidiaconal registers, and editors of ecclesiastical documents, preoccupied with the illustration of contemporary manners and modes of thought which they furnish, are often prone to overlook the forms in which they are cast. Probably few of those who consult such a repertory as Wilkins' *Concilia* take much trouble to consider the precise nature of the instruments which it contains, as compared with the special interests which they were intended to serve; there is a temptation, from which the editor himself was by no means free, to extract individual passages from their husk of common form with some impatience of vain repetitions. But even common forms, with their superficial dryness, have their treasures to yield, and Dr. Irene Churchill, with exceptional opportunities of access to the most important collection of ecclesiastical archives in this country, gives ample proof of the fruit which may be gained from the scientific study of official diplomatic.

"The history of administration," she writes, "is the history or knowledge of the instruments, whether human or documentary, by which the administrator acts." For her purpose the main source of such instruments is the series of archiepiscopal registers at Lambeth Palace. To their compilers the system whose operations they recorded was thoroughly familiar, and no prophetic instinct warned them to annotate their documents for the use of future historians. In any reconstruction of that system, what to them was plain is constantly matter for inference to be drawn from allusions that were sufficient for their immediate purpose. The sources, moreover, on which we have to depend are copies of original documents made for

official reference, and if, in comparing two documents of similar purport, we find a clause which occurs in one omitted from the other, the omission may be due merely to a clerical oversight. The closest acquaintance with stereotyped forms may not always be competent to supply the exact significance of the "etc.," which frequently leaves the end of a sentence to the imagination. Nor is the phraseology in which offices and institutions are described strictly uniform or capable of sharp distinction, and nothing can be more hazardous than the attempt to impose technical limitations upon terms which are in fact ambiguous.

In the present instance materials for the early growth of the system are fragmentary and casual. The earliest of the Canterbury registers is that of Archbishop Pecham, beginning at a period when the offices of the Archbishop's delegates and commissaries had already assumed a prescriptive form and the style of his secretariat was guided by established precedent. What Miss Churchill says of the office of rural dean is generally applicable to the whole subject: the origin and development of its various departments are "largely a matter of conjecture and surmise, partly owing to the lack of record material." Records of the sees of York and Lincoln illustrate the conditions which prevailed during the earlier part of the thirteenth century, and there is no sign that Canterbury was behind its suffragan dioceses in the evolution of a system of which it may reasonably be suspected of supplying the pattern. Early evidence for the history of the province is more abundant than for that of the diocese, but even so the procedure which guided the relations of the metropolitan with his suffragans before the days of Pecham can be ascertained only by occasional glimpses. While, however, the process of working back from the known to the unknown leads to merely tentative conclusions, the registers of Pecham and his successors afford an ample field for the discussion of the system in full working order, with the changes and modifications to which it was subject. The loss of the registers for the period from 1327 to 1349 cannot sufficiently be regretted.

The provincial aspect of the Archbishop's work naturally demands much lengthier discussion than its diocesan side, and two-thirds of Miss Churchill's first volume are devoted to its examination. But the government of the diocese offers points of special interest. Small though its actual area was, it included a number of peculiar jurisdictions locally situated in other dioceses and administered by deans, one of whom, the Dean of Southmalling, held his office as dean of a collegiate church, while the appointments of the others were terminable at the Archbishop's pleasure. Such appointments were subject to varia-

tion: although in the first instance each of the eight peculiars had its own dean, it became customary to combine two or more as convenience dictated, until in later days one dean was habitually appointed for all. In our own day the co-Deans of Bocking, holding the rectories of Bocking and Hadleigh, are a survival of this practice, together with the title of the Dean of Arches. But the status of the latter officer, originally diocesan, became in process of time provincial. The church of St. Mary-le-Bow (*de Arcubus*), from which he took his title as dean of the archbishop's peculiar in London, was the seat of the provincial court, presided over by the official principal and known as the Court of Arches. While the name of the Dean of Arches is sometimes conjoined with those of the official and other commissaries in mandates addressed by the Archbishop to the court, the combination of his office with that of official principal was a late development. While in the smaller province of York the president of the Archbishop's court was his official for the province as well as for the diocese, at Canterbury the commissary general took the place of a diocesan official, with a delegated jurisdiction distinct from that of the president of the Court of Arches.

The history of these departments of administration and their *personnel* demands the closest scrutiny and classification of the communications addressed to them, for from these alone can we obtain a clear conception of their business and the means employed for its execution. How thoroughly Miss Churchill has fulfilled this requirement will be seen by reference, for example, to those sections which deal with the provincial visitations of the archbishops. The sensitiveness of suffragans to any infringement of their rights on the part of a metropolitan was a prominent feature of that conflict between rival jurisdictions which plays so large a part in the history of the medieval Church; and although the province of Canterbury offers no parallel to the strife between the Archbishops of York and the Bishops of Durham, there were certain dioceses in which the visitatorial claims of the metropolitan were expressly limited by compositions drawn up, as regards the sees of Lincoln, London, Salisbury and Worcester, between 1261 and 1268, but not until some sixty years later in the case of Norwich. Difficulties arose in other dioceses where no such agreements existed, notably on the occasion of Archbishop Courtenay's visitation of the diocese of Exeter, where the objections of Bishop Brantingham and his ministers were founded upon the technical plea that the Archbishop was visiting his province before his visitation of his own diocese had taken place. These points are discussed with exemplary fullness and patience, while other sections

treat of provincial visitations in their actual working and with the administration of vacant suffragan sees. Convocation, the Court of Arches and the Archbishop's court of audience receive similarly detailed treatment, and within the sphere of the province falls the Archbishop's jurisdiction over Calais and its neighbourhood, deputed to him by a bull of Urban VI. in 1379. This jurisdiction, dropped after the Treaty of Troyes in 1420, was resumed some twenty years later and was exercised until the loss of Calais in the reign of Mary.

Miss Churchill's material is intricate, and the handling which it needs is delicate and discerning, involving as it does careful consideration of the exact purpose and scope of each document and of the problems which it raises. Her work is not light reading: it is eminently a work of reference, and not even a very thorough index supplies a complete guide to all that may be found in it, for from such a work, as from the sources from which it is drawn, the student will inevitably deduce fresh inferences for himself. It is accompanied by a second volume which contains the necessary *pièces justificatives*, and is, in fact, an invaluable formulary of ecclesiastical procedure, including a long series of forms for the appointment of officials, vicars general, *commissaries* and other executive officers, with commissions of various kinds. The difficulty of making such a selection can be appreciated only by those who have attempted the collation of a number of forms composed with the same end in view. The most conventional phrases can be varied to suit their occasions; the introduction of special clauses is a constant feature; new clauses become habitual to the form; and even mistakes may be perpetuated in its text. We could hardly expect Miss Churchill's collection to furnish a complete illustration of the development of any but the most important of these forms, which might lead to the inclusion of details unessential to her immediate design. Editors of episcopal registers know well how difficult it is to curtail for publication long documents which at first sight are little more than repetitions of one another: their variations, however slight, are so numerous that no single formula will adequately embrace them all. The mandates, for example, by which archbishops committed the issue of summonses for Convocation to the Bishop of London as dean of the provincial college, or, failing him, to the Bishop of Winchester as subdean, while following general precedents, are seldom exactly identical in wording, and the employment of more than one precedent brings out notable differences between them. Further, their issue during vacancies of the archiepiscopal see by the prior and convent of Canterbury involved considerable alterations in their style which cannot be overlooked by a

conscientious editor. Miss Churchill prints the earliest of these mandates from Whittlesey's register (1369), in which the temporary vacancies of the sees of Exeter, Hereford and Norwich necessitated the introduction of a special clause, and adds illustrations of special preambles from the interesting series in the register of Archbishop Arundel, one of which proceeded from the prior and convent. While this covers the requirements of her book, an examination of the copiously documented footnotes to the first volume will discover further differences. Her close scrutiny of her material has left nothing of importance untouched: *omne tulit punctum*, and, if there is room for the elaboration of details, her suggestions point the way to the explorer.

The documents thus printed include extracts from some sources other than the archiepiscopal registers, such as MS. Lambeth 1212, which contains the text of the compositions between Boniface of Savoy and the chapters of Lincoln, London, Salisbury and Worcester; various registers at Canterbury, Rochester and Worcester; and the earliest register of the Prerogative Court, in which incidentally are bound up a few leaves which belong to Archbishop Courtenay's register. Use has also been made of the Black Book of the Arches, on which Miss Churchill contributes a note. In addition to the formal contents of the second volume, she furnishes lists of professions of obedience from suffragans, of programmes of metropolitical visitations, and, last but not least, of the officers who filled administrative posts under the Archbishops. These are modestly described as tentative and provisional, but it is not very likely that future research will add much to them. Although her investigations are concentrated upon the medieval organization of the see and province, an epilogue deals with later modifications of a system which was created during the Middle Ages and whose traditional practice suffered little change at the Reformation.

Miss Churchill is a pioneer in a field which affords ample opportunities to the gleaner, and it is to be hoped that others, fired by her example, will do for other English dioceses and jurisdictions what she has done for the diocese and province of Canterbury. There is no lack of records, and from local sources not only may the administration of the suffragan sees be studied intensively, but further illustration may be given to the history of the province. To all future workers upon her lines, however, her volumes will be an indispensable manual of reference. She possesses in a high degree the power of marshalling and controlling intricate masses of facts and of bringing a strong and clear judgment to bear upon their analysis. We refrain from apply-

ing the misused epithet meticulous to her accuracy; but its scrupulous thoroughness is everywhere manifest, and she is careful to present her documents exactly as she finds them, even to the extent of leaving personal and place names in her own text without modernizing them. Indeed, where these assume erroneous forms, the blame may be confidently attributed, not to her, but to the original sources. A calendar of institutions to benefices in the diocese of Lincoln *sede vacante*, recently printed and including a large batch from Chichele's register, shows that the Archbishops' clerks were by no means particular in this respect; and they were no doubt responsible for converting the surname of Giles of Wyngeworth (Wingerworth, co. Derby) into "Wryngesworth," and Southoure (Southover, near Lewes) into "Southnore" (vol. i., p. 77). Occasionally it might have been useful to identify a name: thus "Achecott" (p. 74) is Edgcott, co. Buckingham. In one place where this has been done (p. 322), the modern form of Yevele (Yeovil) appears in brackets, but the process is reversed in "Merriott" (Meriet). But this is a trifle, and the description on p. 301 of the royal free chapel of St. Michael of Penkridge as "in the town of Stafford" is not a very serious mistake. We notice that on p. 176 the date of the retranslation of Richard Flemyngh by papal bull from York to Lincoln is given as August, 1426, whereas the actual date of the bull is July 20, 1425. Some doubt has been cast upon this latter date by Father Puller in a well-known essay printed in his *Orders and Jurisdiction*, but its genuineness is borne out by Flemyngh's register at Lincoln; and, in the introduction to a series of visitation documents printed in Vol. CXXVII. of the Surtees Society's publications, it has been shown that the pontifical years of Archbishop Kempe were dated from the same day on which he was translated from London to York by a concurrent bull.

A. HAMILTON THOMPSON.

NOTICES

GÖTTERSPALTUNG UND GÖTTERVEREINIGUNG. A. Bertholet. Tübingen.
1933. Pp. 32. RM. 1.50.

An able study of one of the most interesting phenomena in the history of religion. Bertholet, working on a very broad basis, discusses the two opposite tendencies, (a) to regard a deity worshipped in one spot as essentially different from the deity of the same name worshipped at another, (b) to identify gods and goddesses originally distinct.

While most of the illustrations are drawn from the Old Testament, many other religions are cited. Thus, while referring to the different

Yahwehs—e.g., of Jerusalem, Hebron, and Shiloh, there is reference also to the various Baals (though these are recognized as being originally a class rather than individual gods), especially Baal Zaphon, to Greek, Roman, Indian, and Iranian gods, and even to various local types of Mariolatry in Christian countries. The reader will sometimes feel that other explanations than those given by Professor Bertholet are possible and some types of differentiation are not considered. One type, for instance, especially characteristic of India, is found where a god considered under a particular attribute rises to the position of an independent deity.

The identification of different gods and goddesses is usually a simpler and more obvious process, and here again Professor Bertholet has illustrated the point as fully as the limits of a single lecture would permit.

T. H. ROBINSON.

THE EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT. By
W. H. Mackean, D.D. Putnam. 6s.

The object of this book is partly historical and partly controversial. The historical portion, which is full and amply documented, aims at shewing that the Eucharistic teaching of modern Anglo-Catholicism differs from the older High Church traditions in several important particulars. This, indeed, is a fact which can hardly be disputed. The High Church party, even in its Caroline heyday, was always at pains to differentiate itself from Romanism as sharply as possible; and in its opposition to Transubstantiation commonly adhered either to a Virtualist or a Receptionist position. The appeal of the Oxford Movement was to a wider as well as a more ancient tradition, and their use of purely Anglican authorities was chiefly intended to shew that our official standards did not preclude this appeal. It is not surprising either that the Oxford teachers did not at first see the full implications of the appeal to Catholic tradition, or that, later on, they may have overestimated the Catholicity of their Anglican predecessors. Nor, again, is it altogether surprising that under the influence of reaction one side of the Catholic tradition should have been stressed to the point of ignoring the other. What Dr. Gavin in *Liturgy and Worship* and (I think) Dr. Macdonald in his book on Berengarius call "metabolism"—the emphasis on the *change* which befalls the Eucharistic elements—is, as the former shows, a development. It is difficult to extract from the primitive authorities a doctrine which goes beyond "dynamic symbolism," though, indeed, this is not the same thing as virtualism. No Virtualist could use the language of Ignatius, Justin, Irenæus, or Cyprian without considerable qualification. The object of modern Eucharistic theology should surely be to arrive at a synthesis between these two views of the Eucharist, rather than to set them in sharp opposition to each other. Dr. Mackean would probably find it difficult to believe that any such synthesis is possible, or that modern Anglo-Catholic theologians are genuinely anxious to make it. Yet Dr. Gavin has shown with what frankness all the facts of the history of Eucharistic thought can be brought into a single conspectus; Lord Halifax is never tired of appealing to Evangelicals to recognize their dearest truths in the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass; and Fr. H. Whitby (identified in most minds with all that is "extreme") has again and again urged the importance of the symbolic side of the Eucharist.

Dr. Mackean begins his work with a sketch of the position in the years

immediately before the Movement, and draws attention to the great increase in the number of communicants brought about by Evangelicalism. A Communion Service which lasted from eleven to four certainly suggests that the famous "six persons at the Table of the Lord" at St. Paul's on Easter Day in the year 1800 were not a congregation typical of the period. The revival of the doctrine of the objective Real Presence of our Lord in the Sacrament apart from actual reception is traced back to R. H. Froude. Its legitimacy was defended by Newman, but the responsibility for the wide diffusion of it belongs to Pusey, who in his later years "was losing his way in the maze of patristic writers." Much importance is attached to the Bennett case, but the author seems to underestimate the allowance (for what it is worth) which the Judicial Committee gave to Bennett's teaching; for, although he withdrew the ill-advised word "visible," he never retracted his belief in "the real actual presence of our Lord under the form of bread and wine." The author seems to go out of his way to applaud the impartiality of the judgments of the Committee, "free from theological strife and bias," and "governed by no considerations of policy or expediency"—a strange verdict indeed on a body which is charged by two of its own members with having delivered, in another case, a "flagitious" judgment, "of policy, not of law."

But, indeed, the purely controversial portion of the book is slighter than the historical, and, as usual, of less value. In this part Dr. Mackean has hardly attempted anything beyond a repetition of the well-worn arguments, and does not really help towards such a synthesis as has been attempted, for example, by Dr. Brilioth. The eminent Swedish theologian, for all his dread of "materialism" in Eucharistic doctrine, recognizes very fully that "the sacramental presence of the Divine life in the eucharistic elements" is the valid "Johannine" expression of "the immanent-mystical type of religion." It is this same materialism which Dr. Mackean thinks he despises in what he terms the localization of the presence of Christ. Surely it should be universally acknowledged that there is no such localization. According to the Catholic doctrine, the bread and wine do in some sense *become* the Body and the Blood, but it is perilously like nonsense to say that they *are* the Body and the Blood; while to claim for the former the adoration which is due to the latter would certainly be "idolatry to be abhorred by all faithful Christians." Transubstantiation in its proper non-materialistic sense does, for all its difficulties, avoid both these dangers; but if that mode of statement is closed to Anglicans, can we not take refuge in the Archbishop of York's term "accessibility"? Here is a word which our author seems to accept. Might it not be made the basis of a reconciliation?

K. D. MACKENZIE.

**MEMORIALS UPON SEVERAL OCCASIONS: PRAYERS AND THANKSGIVINGS
FOR USE IN PUBLIC WORSHIP.** A. R. Mowbray and Co. 6s.

The Book of Common Prayer, as it has come down to us in the Revision of 1661, is so good that those who love it most cannot but be filled with the desire that it should be better. That desire found one expression in the Revision of 1928. The more we consider that expression, however, the more thankfulness do we feel that its publication "does not directly or indirectly imply that it can be regarded as authorized for use in Churches." That is not to say that there is not much in it that calls

for admiration and gratitude, both for its recognition of a fuller practice and teaching of the Catholic Faith, and for many of the additions which it has made to the rite itself. But there is yet another cause for gratitude which has become more and more manifest as time has gone on. It has given us furiously to think; it has driven us back to liturgical sources; it has led us to make suggestions and experiments; and all this as a paving of the way for the time when there will emerge from all these suggestions and experiments a rite with which the Church in these two Provinces may well feel satisfied. In the book under review we are not concerned with the Liturgy itself, but we may venture to recall, as a real and valuable contribution to a reconstruction of the Canon, the article by Fr. Hebert, S.S.M., on the *Epiclesis* in the October number of *THEOLOGY*; and, as an actual experiment, the use in some churches, *permissu episcopi*, of Bishop Cosin's rearrangement of the Canon of 1661. This experiment, and Fr. Hebert's suggested Canon alike, are not of course to be regarded as settlements, but rather as contributions to the time which must come when the Church in these Provinces, it may be in happy collaboration with her sister in the Province of Wales, will follow the example of other Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury and set herself to make a Service Book more worthy, in ceremonial and ritual, of her great inheritance.

And here, in the book whose title stands at the head of this notice, comes another contribution to the making of such a Service Book. It is concerned with a much less important part of the Common Prayer than that which has to do with the ministry of the Sacraments, but still a very important part of it, which the author describes in his preface as "the second part of the prayers at Matins and, above all, Evensong along accustomed liturgical lines." It is in effect a reconsideration of his own *Occasional Prayers in the 1928 Book Reconsidered*, published by S.P.C.K. three years ago. If it may be described in one word of highest praise it may be by the word "enrichment." That was a word, as all proctors in Convocation know, which came to rival in "blessedness" the word Mesopotamia itself. But it usually referred in those discussions to many things which did not seem to tend, in the opinion of many, to anything which could be described as an "enrichment" of the Book of 1661. But here, in this careful work of the Dean of King's, we have an enrichment of what we, rather incorrectly, describe as the State Prayers, for which we owe him the deepest gratitude. The enrichment consists in both quantity and quality. There are prayers for fifty-two "Occasions," under the headings of *The State; The Church; Christian Life and Education; Industry and the Fruits of the Earth; The Suffering, Dying and Departed*. There are Thanksgivings for twenty occasions; there are some *Evening Prayers*; some *Endings* to be used at the end of any service of intercession or thanksgiving; and an Appendix containing four short Litanies. Those who use the book will be grateful to the editor for printing therein the collects and prayers from the Book of 1661, such, e.g., as the *General Thanksgiving*, and other forms, such, e.g., as the *Anima Christi*, which will always remain in frequent use, thereby saving them from the tiresome distraction of having to turn from book to book in search of what they require.

Enough has perhaps been said to express our gratitude to the editor of these "Memorials" for the great extent of the needs covered by them, and we shall surely desire to express an even greater gratitude for the help

which the Memorials themselves afford to the prayer-life of the Church on its more liturgical side. Their sources are mainly prayers of the divines of the seventeenth century such as Archbishop Laud, Bishop Andrewes and Jeremy Taylor, whose compositions are worthy to rank with the noble contributions of Bishop Gunning and Bishop Reynolds to the Book of 1661; and the translations from the old sacramentaries in Dr. Bright's *Ancient Collects*. Both these sources have done much to enrich this collection of Memorials, and although modern prayers do not afford so rich a mine of devotional material for memorials of a liturgical nature, the editor has not forgotten them; if modern times had produced nothing else than the two prayers of Bishop John Wordsworth and Bishop Francis Paget we should have much to be thankful for, and these are not the only modern contributions to the Memorials. More cannot be said here, except a word of thanks for the one or two Memorials based on Richard Rolle, Dr. John Donne and Thomas Traherne, so beautiful for their quaint piety.

The book ends with four short Litanies which will be found of great value. The last, a "Thanksgiving for the English Saints," will be found full of suggestion at All Saints' tide. It is worth while, perhaps, to anticipate a possible criticism of this Thanksgiving. It might be asked, Has the English Church produced no saints since 1549, as some would dare to say? We are sure that the editor of the *Cambridge Orisons*, from which this Litany comes, would not say that, but surely he is wise in not taking upon himself to make additions to the kalendar on his own private judgment. It is what people are doing, and there is crying need for the Commission, which has often been discussed in Convocation, to work out the principles on which additions to the kalendar may be made with the full authority of the Church in these Provinces. Would it be possible to add one name to this Litany? The only group of saints which has no name at their head is that of "holy queens and matrons"; might not Margaret of Scotland head them? It is true that she was Queen of Scotland, but she was an English princess, and at least not less English than St. Anselm or St. Hugh.

The writer of this notice would only add one or two remarks which are not so much criticisms as queries. In his own, fairly early, copy of Bishop John Wordsworth's commemoration of the Faithful Departed (No. 51), the last sentence runs: "who have served Thee here and are at rest." The addition of the words "and loved" seem somewhat to upset the rhythm of that very beautiful prayer. And is "as Thy servants" in the opening words of Dean Butler's most useful Prayer for the Parish (No. 19) so good as "Thy people" in the Collect for Epiphany II., from which it is taken? "Us" so used is apt to become a little hackneyed. And again, is not the word "multiply" in the Prayer for the Departed (No. 51) rather ugly? Would not "grant," though not meaning quite the same, be better? Once more, though there is the high authority of the Collect for Whit Sunday, is it not better to begin prayers with the vocative "O" before "God" or "Lord" in most instances? Lastly, the editor has boldly faced the very difficult word "inebria" in the *Anima Christi*, and the hardly less difficult "integrum" in the Gelasian Prayer for the Church (No. 10). Anyone who has been accustomed to use the *Anima Christi* with uneducated people knows how difficult it is to explain, and consequently to use, a literal translation of *inebria me*. The common substitution (not translation) *refresh me* is not very satisfactory, and the

proposed *invigorate me* is again not really a translation, but it seems better than *refresh*. Must we not confess that *inebria* in this prayer is really untranslatable, and if we give up trying to translate, might it not be best to use Bishop Andrewes' "ransom me"? (*λύτρωσον, redime*). As to the other phrase *in integrum*, is "into unity" really more correct than Dr. Bright's "to perfection"? We suppose that "into wholeness" would be rather pedantic. After all, there is some authority for Dr. Bright's more familiar translation; "perfect wholeness," in Acts iii. 16, is a translation of *όλοκληρίαν* in the Greek, and *integram sanitatem* in the Vulgate (cf. also the Vulgate of 1 Thess. v. 23 and St. James i. 4).

But these are but very minute crumples in a heap of very beautiful rose-leaves!

H. V. S. ECK.

A SURVEY OF MYSTICAL SYMBOLISM. By Mary Anita Ewer. S.P.C.K.
8s. 6d.

This is a very clearly written, sane and interesting study of a difficult subject upon which much ink has been wasted. The author states that her purpose is twofold. First, to gain a clearer insight into the common background which lies behind all mystical thought; and, secondly, "to provide a tool by which mystical imagery as seen in general literature can be placed also in its larger and more special setting." By symbolism Miss Ewer means conscious analogy, and neither more nor less. She definitely excludes from the purview of the book both hallucination and objective vision, on the one hand, and mere metaphor on the other. The author discerns four chief varieties of symbolism in mystical writings: Comparison between sensory and spiritual experience, comparison between physical and spiritual process, comparison between earthly and heavenly powers, and comparison between earthly and spiritual relationships. The book consists of a very interesting and comprehensive discussion of those four groups of symbols. The reader will find much that is valuable in this treatment of the subject, as, for instance, when he is reminded that, whereas it is frequently pointed out that what the mystic "sees" can usually be traced to his previous creed, "it is not sufficiently pointed out" that the same holds good of the "mystic who 'hears' the voice of God."

It is perhaps unfortunate that the author chooses to speak always of "mysticism" instead of being content with the less ambiguous and more comprehensive expression "religious experience." Much of what she says is clearly applicable to the wider field. Moreover, a discussion of some of the fundamental psychological questions raised—e.g., the relation of Jung's highly important theory of "archaic symbols" to religion—would have added to the value of the work. Nevertheless, this is a book which may be cordially recommended as a very interesting and a safe guide (as far as it goes) in a field which is always dangerous and not infrequently made to appear deadly dull.

LINDSAY DEWAR.

LETTERS TO AN ORDINAND. By R. S. T. Haslehurst. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

This little book would seem to meet a definite need. It is just what is needed to help a young man who is thinking of taking Holy Orders, but perplexed about the sundry questions which particularly beset the Church of England. There is a discussion of such matters as the following: What

Constitutes a Call to the Ministry, Institutionalism in Religion, Obedience to Bishops, Disestablishment, Higher Criticism, Celibacy of the Clergy. Thus it will be seen that the book does not lack variety, as it certainly does not lack interest and a plentiful supply of that uncommon commodity, common sense. It is a book which many a layman might read with enjoyment and profit, although he had no thought of taking Holy Orders.

LINDSAY DEWAR.

THE PARSON AND HIS PROBLEMS. By J. B. Goodliffe. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This book describes the methods adopted by an enterprising and hard-working parson to meet the situation in a large town parish in which all grades of society meet. All the usual activities generally comprehended under the term *parochialia* are discussed, but from a fresh angle, and few clergymen could fail to profit from a reading of this most entertaining book, even if they are sometimes irritated by such expressions as "the larger Catholic Faith."

LINDSAY DEWAR.

MODERN HANDBOOKS ON RELIGION. By A. C. Bouquet, D.D. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons. Seven volumes. 2s. 6d to 6s.

Dr. Bouquet is one of those persons determined to see things and to see them whole, and this series is his attempt to convey to the student and general reader a conspectus of the modern view of religion. The series is a bold venture, and the substance of the argument is strong meat even for the toughest palate. We frankly admit that Vol. I. (*Arguments for the Existence of God*), written in a style not always easy or graceful, made tremendous demands upon the attention and patience of the reader; but the earnest honesty of the writer, and his obvious desire to be fair, gradually won admiration, and in each successive volume the task became easier.

Five volumes have come into our hands. The first we have already mentioned; then follow: (ii.) *Religious Experience*, (iii.) *Phases of Church History*, (iv.) *The World we live in*, (v.) *The Origin of Religion*, (vi.) *Jesus*, and (vii.) *The Nature of God*. The titles indicate the scope of the author's work, and anyone wishing to acquaint himself with the latest views on the relation of religion to contemporary philosophy, psychology, and natural science can be sure that in the appropriate volume of Dr. Bouquet he will find a compendious summary of the position at the cost of a shilling or two.

But Dr. Bouquet's series is something more than a collection of studies in different aspects of religion: he has set out to see the whole position, and in so doing has carved out a special place of his own in modern theological literature. Theology has suffered so much at the hands of specialists exaggerating this and that particular aspect, in disregard of its relation and proportion to the whole, that it is refreshing to meet this attempt to see things whole. For this reason we can commend, indeed recommend, the perusal of the whole series. The more so as Dr. Bouquet is not content merely to take a photograph; he arrives at certain inferences on the future of the Christian religion which are of a challenging character. These conclusions are set out in Vol. VI. (*Jesus*), and this book is perhaps the most important, as it is the most readable, in the whole series.

J. L. BEAUMONT JAMES.